

The LUTHERAN C H U R C H QUARTERLY

Volume XIII

APRIL, 1940

Number 2

WHEN IS A LUTHERAN A "GOOD LUTHERAN"?

By Merle W. Boyer

FRACTIONAL THINKING AND LUTHERAN INHIBITIONS

By Raymond T. Stamm

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS

By Edwin F. Keever

DID LUTHER FOLLOW OCKHAM OR PAUL?

By John O. Evjen

PASTORAL HEROISM IN A TIME OF PANIC

By Theodore G. Tappert

How Should Religion Be Defined? *By Harold L. Creager*

Gospel Preaching in the Christian Year *By Benjamin Lotz*

Nature of Prophecy According to II Peter *By William H. Cooper*

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

TIMES AND NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY

GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

CONTENTS FOR APRIL

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE	110
--------------------------------------	-----

ARTICLES

WHEN IS A LUTHERAN A "GOOD LUTHERAN?" <i>By Merle W. Boyer</i>	111
FRACTIONAL THINKING AND LUTHERAN INHIBITIONS. <i>By Raymond T. Stamm</i>	124
THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS. <i>By Edwin F. Keever</i>	131
DID LUTHER FOLLOW OCKHAM OR PAUL? <i>By John O. Evjen</i>	143
PASTORAL HEROISM IN A TIME OF PANIC: HELMUTH AND THE YELLOW FEVER EPIDEMIC IN PHILADELPHIA, 1793. <i>By Theodore G. Tappert</i>	162

NOTES AND STUDIES

HOW SHOULD RELIGION BE DEFINED? <i>By Harold L. Creager</i>	176
GOSPEL PREACHING IN THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. <i>By Benjamin Lotz</i>	181
THE OBJECTIVE NATURE OF PROPHECY ACCORDING TO II PETER. <i>By William H. Cooper</i>	190

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

Kirk, <i>The Study of Theology</i> (J. Aberly)	196
Asmussen, <i>Die Lehre vom Gottesdienst</i> (G. R. Seltzer)	198
Asmussen, <i>Das Kirchenjahr</i> (G. R. Seltzer)	199
Asmussen, <i>Ordnung des Gottesdienstes</i> (G. R. Seltzer)	199
Ligon, <i>Their Future Is Now</i> (O. F. Nolde)	200
Sherrill, <i>The Opening Doors of Childhood</i> (T. K. Finck)	201
Nolde, <i>Guide Book in Catechetical Instruction</i> (W. D. Allbeck)	202
Greever, <i>Human Relationships and the Church</i> (E. E. Flack)	204
Hoh & Hoh, <i>Two Minutes with God</i> (J. W. Doberstein)	205
Bagger, <i>Forty Thousand Strong</i> (W. R. Miller)	206
Morrison, <i>Let Not Your Heart Be Troubled</i> (P. J. Hoh)	206
Arndt, <i>New Testament History</i> (P. J. Hoh)	207
Weatherhead, <i>The Eternal Voice</i> (J. S. Bishop)	207
Maier, <i>The Radio for Christ</i> (T. B. Peery)	208
Day, <i>The Evangel of a New World</i> (P. J. Hoh)	208
Green, <i>The Devotional Use of the Bible</i> (R. D. Heim)	209
Helps to the Study of the Bible (R. D. Snyder)	209
Riddle, <i>Paul, Man of Conflict</i> (W. C. Berkemeyer)	210
Lietzmann, <i>The Founding of the Church Universal</i> (W. H. Cooper)	212
Thiel, <i>Luther</i> (J. W. Doberstein)	214
Brown, <i>A Teacher and His Times</i> (E. E. Fischer)	215
Strickland, <i>Religion and the State in Georgia</i> (T. G. Tappert)	217
Schilpp, <i>The Philosophy of John Dewey</i> (J. Aberly)	217
Dibelius-Grant, <i>The Message of Jesus Christ</i> (J. E. Graefe)	219
Hanssen, <i>Historical Open Questions</i> (T. G. Tappert)	220

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

Editors

Theodore G. Tappert
Emil E. Fischer
Philadelphia

Harvey D. Hoover
Raymond T. Stamm
Gettysburg

Volume XIII

April, 1940

Number 2

Published quarterly by the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly* (founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849) and *The Lutheran Church Review* (founded in Philadelphia in 1882). Entered at the Gettysburg Post Office as second-class matter.

Indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Subscription \$2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents. Subscriptions and all business communications should be addressed to Professor Harvey D. Hoover, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Manuscripts, books for review, and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to Professor Theodore G. Tappert, 7333 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The aims of THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY are (1) to give intellectual expression to the faith of the United Lutheran Church in America as set forth in its doctrinal basis, to maintain that faith, and to show constantly its relation to the practical religious living of those who hold it; (2) to promote cordial understandings between the bodies of Lutherans, both in America and Europe, and between Lutheran and other Christian groups; (3) to discuss, in a constructive and helpful manner, the relation of the faith of the Lutheran Church to the religious issues involved in contemporary life and thought.

The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they shall be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they shall be free from controversial animus; and that their contents shall be of real scholarly and practical value to the reader. THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY shall be conducted with due regard for the Christian liberty which proves all things and holds fast that which is good, and for which the Lutheran Church has always stood. Differences of opinion, between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, will not of itself exclude articles from publication, since the editors will not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors. The editors reserve the right to reject any article without assigning a reason for their action.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

For several years MERLE W. BOYER was assistant pastor in a prominent Lutheran Church in Chicago where he came into intimate contact with representatives of all types of Lutherans in America. He is now devoting his full time to the study of philosophy in the Graduate School of Chicago University.

After a long and fruitful ministry EDWIN F. KEEVER is living in retirement in Wilmington, North Carolina, where he is continuing the studies of a lifetime.

JOHN O. EVJEN, dean and professor of Philosophy in Carthage College, is known as a learned interpreter of German and Scandinavian theology.

HAROLD L. CREAGER is professor of Biblical Literature and related branches of theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

BENJAMIN LOTZ is pastor of Holy Trinity Church in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM H. COOPER is pastor of Grace Church, Roxborough, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are JOHN ABERLY, president of the Gettysburg Seminary; GEORGE R. SELTZER, assistant professor of Liturgics and Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; O. FREDERICK NOLDE, professor of Christian Education in the Philadelphia Seminary; THEODORE K. FINCK, editor of the Parish and Church School Board of the United Lutheran Church; WILLARD D. ALLBECK, professor of Catechetics and Historical Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; E. E. FLACK, professor of Biblical Literature and dean-elect of Hamma Divinity School; W. ROBERT MILLER, pastor of St. John's Church, Ringtown, Pennsylvania; JOHN S. BISHOP, pastor of Zion Church, Goldsboro, Pennsylvania; RALPH D. HEIM, professor of Christian Education in the Gettysburg Seminary; WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER, pastor of St. Matthew's Church, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania; JOHN E. GRAEFE, special lecturer in the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary.

WHEN IS A LUTHERAN A "GOOD LUTHERAN?"

MERLE W. BOYER

Chicago, Illinois

THERE is a passage in Paul Tillich's autobiographical sketch published in *The Interpretation of History* which should be of interest to Lutherans. The passage reads as follows:

The substance of my religion is and remains Lutheran. It embodies the consciousness of the "corruption" of existence, the repudiation of every social Utopia, including the metaphysics of progress, the knowledge of the irrational demonic character of life, an appreciation of the mythical elements of religion, and a repudiation of Puritan legality in individual and social life.¹

This confession of faith will undoubtedly be puzzling to large numbers of American Lutherans, clergy as well as laity. There are many who consider themselves Lutheran who may find that scarcely any of the principles which Dr. Tillich cites as his connecting link with the Lutheran tradition could be considered as normative in the light of what they regard as their own particular Lutheran convictions. Dr. Tillich writes with such insight and sincerity, however, and with such a wide range of information that his statement must be taken seriously as an affirmation of his recognition of a compelling sense of inner loyalty to what he regards as the central emphases of the Lutheran tradition. Here is a man who is in some sense Lutheran, and yet it is doubtful whether Dr. Tillich would respond favorably if we were to conclude from this that he considers himself a Lutheran churchman. On the other hand, it is not very likely that Dr. Tillich would be admitted into the clerical fellowship of most of our synods on the basis of his confession of faith as a Lutheran. To what

¹ Paul Tillich, *The Interpretation of History*, trans. N. A. Rosetzki and Elsa G. Talmey (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 54.

extent, then, is one justified in using the term "Lutheran" in a case such as this?

The following passage is quoted from an article on the Amsterdam Conference which appeared in one of the British periodicals:

Secondly, there was Niebuhr. He seemed to be a dominating influence upon the Conference, especially upon the Student Christian Movement represented there; and the famous American Lutheran professor came himself to deliver his message.¹

In the eyes of at least one European observer, American Lutheranism was represented at Amsterdam by an adherent of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. This is understandable, for I have heard Dr. Niebuhr referred to as a Lutheran on various occasions, notably on the occasion of his introduction to the audience of the Sunday Evening Club of Chicago. In no case did he seem to resent the use of the term "Lutheran"; but on all the occasions he apparently gave different content to the term than is common in Lutheran circles.

We have cited the above cases as pertinent examples indicating the possibilities of disagreement on the question that is to be considered here, namely, when is one justified in using the term "good Lutheran?" Other examples showing the confusion that arises when we attempt to give content to the term could be cited by the score from the experience of almost every pastor who has had contact with the diversities of opinion among Lutherans of varied backgrounds.

I have found Lutherans of General Synod and Augustana background, who had apparently been subjected to a long period of indoctrination by some pastor keenly interested in the Prohibition question, utterly at a loss for words when they learned that there were groups of American Lutherans who opposed Prohibition. They had come to think of all "good Lutherans"

1 Douglas Wollen, "Amsterdam and After," *The Methodist Recorder*, London: Aug. 24, 1939, vol. LXXX.

as being advocates of Prohibition. I have found other Lutherans of Hauge Synod and Missouri Synod background, respectively, who had been indoctrinated in another way by another pastor, utterly astonished when they learned that there were Lutherans who did not greatly concern themselves about the question of social dancing or secret societies and yet considered themselves good churchmen. One could not be a "good Lutheran," it was held, unless one regarded these questions as matters of principle. I have been in contact with Lutherans who were dumbfounded to find that congregations could consider themselves genuinely Lutheran and yet have a service of worship that came closer to the Roman Catholic service than to the simple evangelistic prayer meeting that they had been accustomed to regard as Lutheran worship. On the other hand, I have found Lutherans who turned pale when they learned that there were congregations daring to use the name "Lutheran" in whose churches the sacrament of Holy Communion was administered in such a way that they could regard the procedure as nothing less than sacrilege.

Anyone at all aware of the historic emphases of Lutheran Christianity will recognize the absurdity of considering these questions, no matter how important they may be, as normative for Lutheranism. The fact remains, however, that even such more or less irrelevant questions can enter as crucial factors for deciding the type of Christian individual or congregation designated as "good Lutheran." Since there is no hierarchy in the Lutheran Church of Europe or America that can set up authoritative norms for the usage of the term "Lutheran," it ordinarily follows that an individual, congregation, or denominational body is at liberty to give varied and sometimes conflicting content to the term. The process of giving such content goes on consciously or unconsciously wherever the word "Lutheran" is used in conversation, in preaching, and in written exposition.

Much of the controversy on questions that arise regarding Lutheran union centers in the attempt to come to some conclusion as to exactly what meanings can be legitimately designated when the term "Lutheran" is used. Many of the debates that I have

heard along this line have their amusing aspects. When such questions as "Can a Lutheran be a 'good Lutheran' after he has joined a secret society?" are argued pro and con, as I have heard them argued more than once with heated enthusiasm and at times with considerable learning, the critical observer will be apt to detect much in the argument that will seem to him to be irrelevant.

The evil effects that arise from the general confusion on the question of what constitutes "good Lutheranism" are in evidence on every hand. Pastors have been prevented from moving from one congregation to another, or from one synod to another, or from one Lutheran body to another because a mysterious rumor gets into circulation that the Rev. A. is not so "good a Lutheran" as he might be. Men of Lutheran extraction and sympathies find it expedient to leave the Lutheran Church for some other denominational body because they have been branded as "poor Lutherans." Pulpit and communion fellowship is made impossible because of the conviction that only "good Lutherans" should practice this fellowship. All this in face of the fact that the trouble is seldom taken to define what is meant by "a good Lutheran."

This particular type of terminological difficulty is not confined to the Lutheran Church. It is the natural concomitant of every religious movement which has had the liberty as an institution to develop in many directions over a period of years and which nevertheless finds it imperative to recognize its fundamental roots in the past by clinging steadfastly to a corporate name that expresses a wealth of emotions and designates a great variety of institutional types, historical events, and theological and ethical principles. The same difficulties arise if the attempt is made to define a "good Presbyterian," a "good Franciscan," or a "good Christian."

The dangers arising from terminological confusion are, however, of unusual importance for American Lutheranism. To all appearances Lutheranism in this country is not divided on questions basic for historic Lutheranism, but rather on minor issues that constantly arise due to the fact that practically all the immensely varied historical currents of Lutheranism are

brought together on American soil. It is a simple matter of terminological emphasis to take one of the hundreds of minor issues and make this issue appear a matter of principle for "good Lutheranism." Given a ministry comparatively untrained in the historical investigations of the Reformation period, knowledge of which is necessary for comprehension of the basic emphases of Lutheranism; given a laity essentially indifferent to historic Lutheranism except as it touches their immediate lives; and given an ecclesiastical leader who is interested in certain immediate and limited ends—given these three factors (and when has there been a time when they have not been present?) a movement can be set afoot at almost any time that will delay the ultimate union of Lutheran bodies a hundred years.

It seems obvious that the term "Lutheran" is used to designate at least four different types of persons. It is used, first of all, to refer to individuals who have been reared within the Lutheran faith. From this point of view one has been reared more or less as a Lutheran, for exactly at what point is the line to be drawn delimiting the Lutheran influence? A person coming within this class may have been baptized a Lutheran, exposed to Lutheran influences through parents, relatives, or friends, introduced to the Christian faith by Luther's Catechism, or even confirmed in the Lutheran Church. His contacts with Lutheranism may be through one or all of these channels. The immediate effects of these contacts may be for all practical purposes negligible, and on the other hand their influence may be far greater than the individual himself realizes.

Every city pastor has had experiences with strangers who suddenly emerge from nowhere requesting baptism for their children or burial for their dead, apparently anxious for some mysterious reason to have these rites performed for them as Lutherans by a Lutheran pastor. When questioned as to their Lutheranism it becomes clear that there is no doubt that they consider themselves "good Lutherans" even though they may not have seen the inside of a church for a decade. If one is inclined to doubt their status as Lutherans, the inquisitor may find to his

surprise that he has an argument on his hands or that he has actually offended a defenseless and apparently sincere person.

The replies of these unchurched people to queries as to their Lutheranism usually bring out the fact that they have been baptized Lutheran, or that a grandmother who was a Lutheran had somehow impressed upon them the importance of retaining a Lutheran consciousness, or that they had attended a Lutheran Sunday School, parochial school, or catechetical class. For some of these people the vague associations that cluster around their Lutheran heritage seem to be very deeply rooted, to the point where men and women whom one would ordinarily consider as indifferent show evidences of genuine emotion. Are these people to be considered Lutheran? Faced with the necessity of a decision, there are few pastors who do not bury their dead and baptize their children, only to find within a few months that they have disappeared once more into the maelstrom of city life.

Within the class of those who can be called "Lutheran" in the sense that they have been reared Lutheran, must be placed those who have for one reason or another deliberately broken with the church that nourished them but who have nevertheless never inwardly rejected their heritage in its entirety or removed themselves from the circle of its influence. We shall allow ourselves a short digression in order to show the importance of this group.

If it were possible to make a thorough study of the losses of the Lutheran Church in America to other denominations, I venture to say that such a study would reveal that a surprisingly large percentage of the intellectual leaders who have removed themselves officially from the Lutheran fold would prove to be men who come within this class. From colonial days, when members of the second or third generation of the Muhlenberg family ceased to consider themselves Lutheran, down to the present day when the leadership of the Tillichs, Weigles, Niebuhrs, and Paucks is exerted through extra-Lutheran channels, many men of Lutheran rearing and sympathies with high intellectual attainments have quietly left the Lutheran Church. Seldom, however, were

they able or willing to reject their heritage. The result has been that much of the intellectual strength of Lutheranism, and this intellectual strength has been a part of the Lutheran tradition at all times and places where that tradition had made itself felt, has been exerted in America outside the bounds of official Lutheranism.

That this has been a tragedy not only for the Lutheran Church but for American Protestantism in general, is seldom recognized. Lutheranism in America has at no time rejected the traditional Lutheran emphasis on Christian education and the legitimate role of intellectual pursuits within the life of the church. The high percentage of seminary-trained ministers in the Lutheran Church as compared with other Protestant denominations is an indication of the tenacity with which American Lutherans have clung to their intellectual heritage despite the necessity of overcoming the almost insurmountable difficulties that were concomitant with the adjustment of a continental type of religious education to the American scene. The constant loss of so many trained intellectual leaders, however, has resulted in a delimitation of intellectual interests to the consideration of problems that have, in the main, grown out of the complex development of Lutheranism on the continent. Due to this loss of the more original and venturesome Lutheran thinkers, American theologians have been inclined to proceed with their work by taking sides with one or the other school of thought in the Lutheran tradition. They have ended by repeating once more on American soil the age-old quarrels of Reformation, scholastic, rationalistic, pietistic, or liberal Lutheranism.

Since these theological quarrels did not emerge from the religious life of American Lutheran congregations, but rather place the pall of their influence over this life through the instrumentality of ministers trained under one or the other school of thought, the average Lutheran of today finds himself in a state of confusion in regard to theological questions. He has been made conscious of the seriousness and importance of theology. Ordinarily he has a much keener sense of need for theology than

is common among members of other denominational groups. To be satisfying such a theology must carry forward the affirmations of the tradition that has led him to Christ, but it must also speak to him in intimate terms of his own religious life and experience as a member of an American congregation, living in an American community. The constant loss of leadership to other denominations has left few within the Lutheran fold who are willing or able to attempt this task of providing a theology for the American Lutheran who experiences this need.

The result is that much of the theology that inevitably finds its way into this intellectual vacuum is that of the distorted Biblicism of certain fundamentalists or chiliast groups or the remnants of Lutheran Scholasticism or Pietism, neither of which influences augurs well for the prospects of the Lutheran Church of the future. Once theological principles are entertained and accepted and given the name "Lutheran," they are cherished with characteristic Lutheran tenacity. Herein rests the danger of Lutheranism for all of American Protestantism. American Lutheranism is faced with the possibility of allowing itself to drift theologically to the point where it may become a solid and impenetrable ecclesiastical block, representing a peculiar type of American denominationalism that will emphasize the less desirable rather than the best elements in the "Conservative Reformation."

It is interesting to contrast the Lutheran Church of America and of Sweden in this respect. The Church of Sweden retained her intellectual leadership in a large measure even to the point of placing the liberal Nathan Soederblom at the head of the ecclesiastical organization as archbishop. Today at the University of Lund, as nowhere else in the Lutheran world, theologians with their roots in the past but with their eyes to the future work courageously to produce Lutheran theology that will meet the needs of modern men. If men like Soederblom had worked in America the chances are that some synodical body would have found that they were not "good Lutherans" and would have carefully directed their intelligence and genius into Congregational, Presbyterian, or Episcopal channels.

A second type of person that is designated by the term "Lutheran" is the person whose present activities as a Christian are carried on through the channels of a Lutheran congregation. Membership in a Lutheran church may come as the result of family tradition, social convention, a voluntary act of decision, or a compelling sense of religious need. Regardless of the reasons that lead people to become active members in a Lutheran church, every pastor is aware of the fact that this membership may mean everything or nothing in the life of the individual. To what extent are the communicants of our churches "good Lutherans?" Here again there is no fixed norm for answering this question. Ultimately, however, it is the practicing churchman who gives content to the term "an American Lutheran." That which is distinctive in their living and thinking as religious men is that which must come to be regarded as the distinctive characteristic of American Lutheranism.

Take the ordinary Lutheran layman, place him alongside the Baptist, Presbyterian, or Episcopalian who works with him in his office, question them about their views on religion, and you may be surprised to find what few distinctive differences are to be found among the members of the group. It would seem that the trend in the direction of the leveling of denominational lines is on the increase rather than otherwise. Unless Lutherans again bring religious education into the home, adopt a general parochial system of education, or make their Sunday School and catechetical instruction much more effective and distinctive than it has been in the past, there seems little prospect of stemming the tide. If a "good Lutheran" communicant does not differ from a "good Episcopalian" communicant or a "good Presbyterian" communicant, there seems to be little point in considering church membership as normative for "good Lutheranism."

A third type of person that is designated by the term "Lutheran" is a person whose Christian view of life is based on a personal conviction as to the truth and validity of the Lutheran symbolic formulations. Following the traditional Lutheran emphasis on the necessity of agreement on doctrinal questions, this

could probably be set up as the most decisive norm for the use of the term "good Lutheran." But here again the possibilities of confusion and aimless controversy are almost endless. Such a norm assumes first of all an intellectual comprehension of the symbolic formulations and secondly a conscious affirmation of belief in these formulations.

There are thousands of members of the Lutheran Church who have little if any knowledge of the existence of the Book of Concord, or of its content beyond the Small Catechism. There are hundreds of busy pastors who have neither the time nor the technical equipment necessary for the comprehension of the theological principles of the Reformation that lie behind the Confessions. To ask what the Reformers meant by an article of the Augsburg Confession is to state a problem that would require considerable study, and even then the investigators could hardly hope for general agreement. Moreover, a comparative study of the various formulations that compose the Book of Concord is bound to show differences of emphasis that offer endless possibilities for disagreement among those who accept the Confessions as normative. Assuming that general agreement on the meaning of the Confessions has been arrived at, there is the additional task of eliciting a uniform degree of belief for all the articles of the Confessions among all who claim to be Lutheran. Anyone who is under the illusion that union of all "good Lutherans" can be brought about on this basis has little comprehension of human nature on the one hand and the characteristics of church organizations on the other.

A fourth type of person that is designated by the term "Lutheran" is the person whose views as a Christian are concurrent with, derived from, or analogous to the views held by Luther. The breadth of this statement indicates how difficult it is to set up Luther's own views as normative. Are we to accept the teachings of the "young Luther" or of the "old Luther" as normative? To what extent is Roger Williams, who was deeply influenced by reading Luther, to be considered "Lutheran?" To what extent was Karl Barth as the author of the *Epistle to the*

Romans a "Lutheran?" These questions indicate some of the interesting problems that arise if Luther's teachings are to be considered normative.

We have pointed out that a man may be considered more or less a "good Lutheran" as he falls within one or more of the following classes of Lutherans: (1) He may be a Lutheran by rearing and education, in which case his world-view may be profoundly influenced by his Lutheran training even though he is only vaguely aware of this influence. (2) He may be a Lutheran as a practicing churchman. (3) He may be a Lutheran as a theoretical churchman in that his faith is in agreement with the symbolic formulations. (4) He may be a Lutheran as a disciple of Dr. Martin Luther. Most of us who consider ourselves Lutheran are a confused mixture of all four classes.

There are some who could be rated "good Lutherans" under class 1, 2, and 3 of our classification who would have to be considered as "poor Lutherans" in class 4. Those theologians, for example, who have their roots in seventeenth century Lutheran Scholasticism rather than in the Reformation era have more in common with the Aristotelian views of Calovius and Gerhard than with the nominalism of Luther. On the critical questions of the doctrine of the Word of God and of the church they find their support in seventeenth century Lutheranism rather than in Luther. On the other hand, much of the strength of Lutheranism which still remains in Germany rests in men, such as the followers of Karl Holl,² who are "good Lutherans" in class 4, but very indifferent Lutherans judging by the norms of classes 2 and 3.

This brief exercise in clarification has indicated some of the difficulties that arise when one attempts to set up norms for delimiting the class of "good Lutherans." We suggest the following principles subject to modifications on further investigation:

² Cf. Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*. Bd. I, *Luther*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1932.

1. The adoption of any one standard for the use of the term "Lutheran" is an arbitrary judgment, and should be recognized and admitted as such by those who adopt that standard.

2. On the adoption of any one standard the term "good Lutheran" is not automatically defined, but presupposes a sliding scale of comparatively "good Lutherans," according as the standard is intended to measure (a) theological tendency, (b) congregational loyalty, (c) fidelity to the Confessions, (d) synodical regularity.

3. In using the term "good Lutheran" to designate a fellow Lutheran it is necessary to state specifically which norm (or norms) is used and to what extent a person is more or less a "good Lutheran" on the sliding scales within at least four different classes of Lutherans.

4. The synodical body that fixes standards for determining "good Lutheranism" is at liberty to take the steps in that direction that are regarded as expedient. But the standard should not be made to operate so as to deprive others not affiliated with the body of the right to be called "good Lutherans."

Efforts at clarification and definition are always of secondary importance. Lutheran Christianity will continue no matter what name is given to it. Men will still persist in adopting convenient norms that will allow them to consider themselves Lutheran regardless of historic norms. Groups will find it imperative to set up their own standards as to what constitutes a "good Lutheran." The roots of the difficulty for Lutherans probably rest in Luther's own views, for in emphasizing the importance of the church as the congregation of true believers, he broke the authority of all institutional norms. In placing the individual as alone responsible over against a God of justice and of love, he relegated all corporate ecclesiastical organization to a rôle of secondary importance. The Christian thus finds himself in the paradoxical position where he can never separate himself from the church and yet must never allow himself to become dependent upon the institutionalized church for his salvation. The problem of living in the midst of this paradox and the task of reconciling this paradoxical

situation in his society, place a strenuous responsibility upon the shoulders of the Lutheran churchman at all times and places. This problem and this task stand directly before American Lutheranism today, and no amount of quibbling or ecclesiastical diplomacy will suffice to ease the tension of the situation for the individual or for the various Lutheran bodies that have found roots on American soil.

FRACTIONAL THINKING AND LUTHERAN INHIBITIONS

RAYMOND T. STAMM

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

BEFORE Lutheranism can make the greater contribution toward the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth as it is in heaven which is rightfully expected of it, and which it ought to be making, it must overcome certain inhibitions which have arisen in connection with its justifiable desire to safeguard its theological and confessional tenets. These inhibitions are due to an unfortunately frequent way of stating our attitude toward the social applications of the Gospel in the form of dilemmas which are as paralyzing to progress as they are specious and unnecessary. We need a saw to cut off the horns from six self-imposed and false dilemmas in order that we may substitute wholeness of thinking for the "either-or" fallacies involved in them:

1. Either an Individual Gospel with an evangelical theology, or a Social Gospel with a modernistic, humanistic theology.
2. Either salvation out of this world for a future life in heaven, or an effort to achieve the Good Life in this world without reference to personal immortality.
3. Either salvation by the grace of God in Christ through faith, with good works as the consequent fruits motivated by gratitude, or activism and self-salvation by one's own merits, with good works motivated by the perception of the present penalties for neglecting them.
4. Either a religious and spiritual approach, or a moralistic and materialistic philosophy of life.
5. Either submission to the authority of the Scriptures, or the assertion of the proud pretensions of human reason.

6. Either the preservation of the Lutheran Confessions by insisting on the Individual Gospel and isolating ourselves from other churches and from co-operative religious movements, or the loss of these by joining with other denominations to establish the Kingdom of God on earth.

These dilemmas have only to be stated to be repudiated forthwith as a misrepresentation of the Lutheran position; for misrepresentations they certainly are. But the sad fact is that they are in some cases lodged so firmly in our thinking that it is exceedingly difficult to eradicate them, because they furnish a seemingly respectable rationalization for failure or unwillingness to bring forth the fruits of our faith and to make our ethical and moral living more strenuous and exacting than it could ever have been under the system of Law and Merits. To what extent do these false dilemmas and their consequent inhibitions still lurk beneath the surface of our Lutheran thinking? Would a candid examination of our books and periodical literature exonerate us from the charge that we lack that wholeness of thinking which teaches men to substitute "both-and" for the fractional "either-or?" To show further both the need and the possibility of such catholicity of sympathies and thought, the following considerations are offered on these six points:

1. Can the production of the fruits of the Spirit by the individual who is saved by grace through faith in Christ be taken for granted? How often are these fruits frozen even in bloom, or ruined by the insects of an evil social environment? On the other hand, is a passion for the Social Gospel really incompatible with our Lutheran theology? Since the individual does not exist and live and grow spiritually in isolation from his matrix in human society, and since "society" is a meaningless and potentially vicious abstraction apart from the individuals who compose it, we seem to have a clear case for insisting upon saving both the individual *and* society, not *first one and then the other*, but *both simultaneously*.

2. What would a search for the reasons why so many of our members have to be listed in the "Losses Otherwise" columns

of our parochial reports reveal concerning the possibility, or at least our success, in saving sinners out of this world, while leaving the world itself to accelerate its way to the final burning? Is one who is not interested in establishing the Kingdom of God on earth as it is in heaven really being saved for the next world? On the other horn of dilemma are impaled the humanists who say that they have given up belief and hope in personal immortality because, they charge, orthodoxy has been making opium for the people out of it. These have foolishly cut themselves off from the only hope and point of view which can give adequate meaning to human existence, as the "orthodox" are thoroughly right in insisting. We ought rather to say that the Kingdom of God is both present on earth and future in heaven, and that it is both "within" the heart of the individual Christian and "among" society as an order of life that is steadily leavening and becoming more inclusive of all human lives and interests. While the Kingdom is not *of* this world, the Christ of John's Gospel specifically warned His followers that they were not to be taken away from this world immediately, but were to stay here for a while, and, as branches of the Vine, to bear much fruit. In the Lord's Prayer we pray, when rightly interpreted, "Thy Kingdom come, on earth as it is in heaven."

3. It is crystal clear, and should long since have been recognized as axiomatic, that man, who owes his very existence moment by moment to the will of his Creator, can do nothing by his own power to save himself. But when we study the career of St. Paul, who never for a moment allows us to forget this point, we find that his life was the most active, fruitful, and effective in establishing the Kingdom of God in the Roman Empire. He felt himself to be a chosen instrument through whom God in Christ was working salvation for others. And we need to ask ourselves whether, as far as our human life and experience on earth are concerned, God ever uses any other means than the human beings in Christ's Body the church to make effective in this world the salvation which He wrought in Christ by reconciling the world to Himself. Salvation by character and merits for good works

we do not claim; but neither is it a question of either faith or works. It is faith evidencing and vindicating itself in the processes of salvation and sanctification.

That, and nothing less than that, is the essence of Paul's religion. In every age, Paulinism has suffered from fractional interpretation and application. Not the least pernicious has been the custom of dissecting the body of his Epistles into "doctrinal" and "practical" sections, thereby obscuring the organic connection between grace, faith, and the ethics of the Spirit. Paul never makes a "practical application" without basing it upon the great central experience in his religion, and, on the other hand, he never discusses "justification by faith" without in the same breath and context urging its expression in life. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," he declares in Rom. 8:1, and then, in verse 12, "So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh." "We are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified in Him" (Rom. 8:16-17). He concludes his long chapter to the Corinthians on the Resurrection with "Wherefore, be ye steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for as much as ye know that your labor is not vain in the Lord," and then goes on in Chapter 16 with "Now concerning the collection for the saints." Writing to the Colossians, he says, "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the church" (Col. 1:24). To recapture the moral earnestness of Paul the Christian, we need to read and read again his letters, from the point of view of the inseparability of grace, faith, and the ethics of the Spirit which is revealed therein. In its justifiable and necessary reaction against all attempts at self-salvation by good works and merits, Lutheranism needs today, as always, to guard against the fractional thinking of those extremists whose reasoning is virtually this: Pride is sin; doing good works tends to make those who do them proud; therefore good works are a danger or a hindrance

to salvation! The forensic concept of justification—acquittal of a criminal at the bar of justice—is only *one* of the metaphors in which Paul expressed his deliverance; the reconciliation of an enemy, the forgiveness of one hopelessly in debt, the manumission of a slave by purchase, and sonship by adoption were others; and he was equally and vitally interested in the power of the Spirit to produce fruit in his life and in the lives of his converts, so that they might be “sincere and void of offense unto the day of Christ; being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God” (Phil. 1:10-11). To this end, though free from all men, he made himself everybody’s slave, in accordance with that mind which was also in Christ Jesus. Now this is high ground—the highest ground religiously, and hence ethically, possible, and we need to keep our grip on the solid rock, lest we slip into the crevasse of magic, where the doctrine of justification by grace through faith is perverted into an easy-going legal fiction which has been secured by means of bribing an angry judge by the death of Christ. “God forbid,” was Paul’s answer over and over again to those who proposed to continue in sin that grace might abound.

4. Religion minus ethics and morals equals magic, and the term “spiritual” has no real content when it is divorced from the ethical and the moral aspects of being. Moreover, as far as our life and experience on this earth go, is there any conceivable spiritual quality that is not dependent upon material human bodies and material things for its manifestation and expression? Clearly it is not a question of the “spiritual” versus the “material,” but of the spiritual expressed in and through the material. And, since God is the Father of all mankind, our spiritual relationship to Him involves at every step our social attitudes and conduct and our treatment of all His other children. The attempt to enjoy a fellowship of *being* with God without a fellowship of *will* with Him has always been a snare and a delusion, as witness the failure of the Mystery Religions, whose devotees ate the substance of their gods in their sacraments and thought thus to have fellowship with them even to the point of becoming one with the Deity

while all too often keeping the "spiritual" and the ethical in conveniently separate compartments. Without constant reference to man's status in society, the concept of sin becomes more and more a pale, colorless abstraction. Even when we take sin in its root essence and manifestation as setting up the will of the creature against that of his Creator, we find that man's reasons for doing this are by no means unconnected with his will to mistreat his fellow man. Sin and righteousness manifest themselves not alone in and through the body, and not alone through the spirit, but through the unitary human personality and all so-called "material" things which man controls and uses for his purposes of good or evil.

5. When we begin to ask just *how* God gave His revelation and inspired the Scriptures, we do not get far before we realize how false is the dilemma, either the Scriptures or human reason. For God will be seen to have used every faculty of the writers of Scripture in giving His revelation. That included their reason. It included also their wills as they responded to God's will. They were always asking, "What does the Lord God require of me?" And their answers were given, not in timeless abstractions, but always with reference to the total life situations—political, social, and religious—in which they found themselves. They did not overemphasize the concept of God's transcendence at the expense of His immanence, or vice versa. Their God was not a far-away abstraction but a Person at work in, and in control of, history. To translate the record of their experiences from the Greek and Hebrew languages into modern English and stop there is not enough. We must also translate from their environment into ours, and here again it is not a question of human reason versus revelation. Human thinking inspired by God's Spirit must guide us at every step. Times without number in our Lutheran literature we see the human reason made synonymous with human pride and willful self-assertion against God and His revelation. Now a warning against the pride which goes before destruction is always needed. But, on the other hand, we must never forget that it is impossible to construct a systematic theology without

employing the same human reason which too many of our writers have tried to deprive of all validity at the outset! And such writers are often the proudest of men, claiming to boast only in the Lord, while their self-confident assurance in the completeness and finality of their own dogmatic constructions of revelation equals or exceeds the "pride" of the most arrogant humanistic or communistic opponents of religion who call upon the name of reason and modern science to justify *their* dogmatism. It is not a question of revelation or reason, but of revelation given, received, interpreted, and applied through the human reason which is energized and guided by the Spirit of God.

6. The warning of Jesus that "whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's shall save it" applies also in a very true sense to the problem of preserving the confessional integrity of our church. By isolating ourselves from other churches and co-operative religious movements we should not only be hiding our light under a bushel but should be giving aid and comfort to the forces of evil which are only too happy to see us self-divided that they may conquer. To adopt the attitude that we have nothing to learn from the testimony of other denominations to their experience of Christ, and nothing to learn from the Gospel treasures *new* as well as old that God has to reveal to us through the experiences of the future, would be in reality to repudiate the Gospel of John, which, if it is anything at all, is the Gospel of Ever-Greater-Things-to-Be. (See John 1:50-51; 14:12.) Denominational isolationism would be the refusal of that venture of faith which is our Lord's primary requirement of us. If, with that catholicity of thinking and acting which is indispensable today as always, we are willing to venture to find our life by losing it, our faith is certain to be vindicated against all the inhibiting fears of these dilemmas. Like the lion in the path of the Christian in "Pilgrim's Progress," we shall find them powerless except to frighten sleepy pilgrims in the dark.

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS

EDWIN F. KEEVER
Wilmington, North Carolina

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS are those Bible Songs in which the writers devote their enemies to destruction. They are also termed "Cursing Psalms," "Condemnatory Psalms," "Judgment Psalms," and are otherwise characterized. Of this kind are Psalms 35, 55, 59, 69, 79, 109, 137, and others. Objections have long been raised to the effect that such expressions of malevolence are unworthy of a true religious spirit and shake the Christian's confidence in the divine authority of the sacred Scriptures. Such an attitude is, to say the least, hardly in accord with the logical and cultural interpretation of human history.

A recent writer (Beverly R. Tucker in *The Gift of Genius*), speaking of David, says that he was a cyclothymiac, by which he means a person with cyclic periods of elevation and depression, without being actually insane. In the Psalms, says he, David poured out the white heat of his deep devotional soul in turbulent ecstasies of exaltation, as seen in Psalm 24, and then to relieve his depression he laid at the foot of the throne of his God the dead, leaden weight of his despair, as we read in Psalm 25. This view may seem to accord with the modern development of psychoanalysis, but it is quite out of harmony with the plain facts of David's psychology and religious history. Historically it is psychofiction. In the discussion which follows, after New Testament precedent, we may view David as the representative Psalmist, other Bible songs being in the same poetic form and spirit.

Henry Ward Beecher, a famous American preacher and writer who made some contribution to the agitation which led to the Civil War, and who missed something in the study of his Bible, is reported to have said that "David seems to have been inspired at times by the spirit of the Lord, and at other times

by the spirit of the Devil." Quite a number of critics have viewed the Hebrew Songs from the same oblique angle. It is a fair question to ask what they expect in front of the historical and cultural background revealed to us in the Old Testament. That book is not a textbook of abstract virtue. It is a narrative of actual life in all its complexities, a book of facts and experiences of real human beings—the moral and religious mirror of a past age, but the interpreter of everlasting truth.

THE CURSE

Imprecation may involve the emotional elements of obloquy, opprobrium, censure, aspersion, detraction, calumny, defamation, disgrace, and infamy; also of the oath, malediction, anathema, excommunication, and curse. The Imprecatory Psalms very forcefully employ most if not all these shades of expression. Let us notice the curse.

Cursing is doubtless as old as the gift of human speech. Man began his earthly career beneath the shadow of two curses: the first upon disobedience of the divine Law, the second upon the ground whence he was to draw his living. Blessing and cursing are simply the primitive moral terms which register the opposing consequences of good and evil in human thought and life. These consequences inevitably follow the right and wrong relations toward God. Blessing and cursing are the expression of the benevolent and malevolent emotions. They imply a certain impotence on the part of the person who would invoke good or evil upon his neighbor; and therefore the mysterious higher powers are besought to intervene. It is understood of course that these higher powers are favorable to the suppliant and against his enemy. This method of baneful retaliation may be spoken or written and recorded with the poisonous stylus of outraged emotion and diabolical revenge.

However, after studying the ancient records I take a higher view of what is called the curse. It is Jehovah who utters the first curses: one upon the serpent, another upon the ground. The

turpitude involved was disobedience of the divine will; and here we discern the first whisperings of the moral Law—that is to say the mental and physical subjection to either one of two personalities: the Creator of man on the one side and His antagonist on the other, the latter being too subtle for unsophisticated humanity just ushered into a world of attractive wonders. We may therefore regard the curse as the inevitable sequence to the violation of the divine will. From here it weaves its way like a black strand through what might have been the golden fabric of human history. The first murderer was cursed by the same God. Noah cursed his son for irreverence. Joshua laid a curse upon the man who would attempt to rebuild Jericho. The last word in the Old Testament is a curse upon the head of him who should reject the Holy Prophet.

In the New Testament we read of the 'Woes' which our Lord pronounced upon the cities wherein His greatest works were done with little response, and upon the Scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites. These were not actual or implied curses. The Greek word in the Gospels (Matthew and Luke) is *ouai* which is an exclamation of pain, anger, warning, sorrow, the equivalent of the Hebrew *oy*, *ho*, et al. Alas! Matthew says He "upbraided" (*oneidizo*) the cities, i.e. reproached them, cast into their teeth, shamed them. The same word is found in the passage "Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you." Christ would hardly violate His own precept, even under pressure: "Bless them that curse you." Paul was perhaps more forceful when he said "If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema."

PAGAN CURSES

Bible curses in both form and intent have their parallels in many religions among all nations. Such imprecations not only loosed the demons, but also acted upon the celestial gods themselves, and by binding their action to the very words, turned them to evil purposes. The gods attached to each man were changed from protectors to malevolent enemies. We read in the ancient Chaldean records:

The malicious imprecation acts on man like a wicked demon,
 The voice which curses has power over him;
 The malicious imprecation is the spell (producing) disease;
 The malicious imprecation slaughters this man like a lamb;
 His god oppresses him in his body;
 His goddess creates anguish in him;
 The voice which curses covers him and loads him like a veil!

May Ishtar, queen of heaven and earth, strike him in the presence of gods and men, and entice his servants to perdition!

May all the gods whose names are mentioned in this inscription curse him with a curse from which he can never be released! May they scatter his race until the end of time!

In Ezra we read that Darius the Mede laid a curse upon "all kings and peoples that shall put forth their hand to destroy this house of God which is at Jerusalem."

The Romans addressed many of their formulas to the infernal gods, itemizing all the members of the body. They frequently used lead for such inscriptions as a cheap and durable material. One surly fellow wrote: "As this lead is useless, so be so-and-so useless." Cursing and blessing were also practiced among the Greeks, differing somewhat from the Hebrew type. Sophocles makes Philotetes pray:

But, O my fatherland
 And all ye gods who look on me, avenge,
 Avenge me on them all in time to come,
 If ye have pity on me.

CHRISTIAN CHURCH CURSES

One might suppose that the Christian church, after some centuries at least, had absorbed enough of the spirit of her Lord to abolish the curse, even as a weapon of discipline. But it seems that the pagan and Jewish maledictions passed into her life verbatim. Here is one in contracted form from Henry Charles Lea's *Studies in Church History*; it begins with invocations to the angels, saints, elect, virgins, thrones, cherubim, prophets, etc., and then proceeds:

Let him be accursed living and dying, eating, drinking, fasting or athirst, slumbering, sleeping, waking, walking, standing, sitting, lying, working, idling. . . . Let him be accursed outside and inside; accursed in his hair and accursed in his brain; accursed in the crown of his head, in his temples, in his forehead, in his ears, in his brows, in his eyes, in his cheeks, in his jaws, in his nostrils, in his front teeth, in his back teeth, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his upper arms, in his lower arms, . . . in his thighs, in his knees, in his shins, in his feet, in his toes, and in his nails. . . . May Christ, the Son of the living God, curse him throughout his kingdom, and may Heaven with all its virtues rise up against him to his damnation, unless he repents and renders due satisfaction. Amen. So be it. So be it. Amen.

Such was a general form of malediction on petty thieves and similar malefactors. Hardened sinners might make light of such imprecations, but their influence upon believers was terrific. If my memory serves me a volcanic eruption such as the above was poured out upon Luther. The ceremony of malediction was quite dramatic. Amid the gorgeous and impressive ceremonial of worship the bishop, surrounded by twelve priests bearing flaming candles, solemnly recited the awful formulas which consigned the evil-doer and all his generation to eternal torment; and as the sentence of perdition came to its climax, the attending priests simultaneously cast their candles to the ground and trod them out as a symbol of the quenching of a human soul in the eternal night of hell. However, we should not forget that in the turbulent ages of the church's experience she had no other than spiritual weapons to inspire fear and enforce discipline in the minds of desperate and determined foes.

Formulas like the above, whether Christian, Jewish, or pagan, may read like protracted outbursts of malevolent emotion, but we must remember that their efficacy consisted partly in a certain repetition; also that among the pagans, as for example with the Assyrians, each part of the body was controlled by a particular god or goddess. We can observe a suggestion of this in the signs of the Zodiac of our old Almanacs. Monotheists of course place all bodily functions under the influence of one God. The ceremony of inculcating national righteousness and of deprecating

dereliction among the ancient Jews was quite dramatic and forceful. After crossing Jordan the tribes were divided into two equal bands, one in front of Mt. Ebal, the other in front of Mt. Gerizim. The priests and Levites chanted the curses toward the former and the blessings toward the latter, and the people responded "Amen." Such assemblies must have had high value in the education of the succeeding generations. The youth and children could never forget such a demonstration.

CURSING WORDS

The blessing and cursing recorded in the Bible are not the mere utterance of a prophecy, as some would like to interpret, nor the passionate outburst of emotion reciprocating a benefit or offence received. The curse was regarded as an actual blight invoked and imposed through the control of some divine power. The converse is true of the act of blessing. Isaac and Jacob thus blessed their sons. I feel convinced that when our Lord uttered the beautiful words of the Beatitudes and also the bitter sentences of indignant disappointment over the unrepentant cities, He was not pronouncing the mere futurity of prediction, but that He was enouncing and emphasizing the sure retribution which the eternal justice of God would visit on the one hand upon the downtrodden masses and on the other upon the stubborn unbelievers, each in due measure.

The Authorized Version uses the word "curse" to translate eleven Hebrew words. The English word seems to be a generic term which perhaps covers some of the finer shades of meaning attached to the folk-lore of the ancient Hebrews. These were stock words in "books" or collections of curses and blessings, formulated by priests whose right it was to conduct the ritual (Cf. 2 Chron. 34:24, Exod. 17:14, Deut. 29:21 sq.).

THE PSALMS

Having discussed cursing which so many lament as the animus of certain Hebrew songs, let us examine the Psalms

themselves. In a practical way and not without a touch of humor we may call many of them the Military Psalms. Of this character I have counted sixty-four. In all of them you will find some allusion or metaphor appropriate to the military art and life. They were written and sung in all periods of the turbulent history of the Hebrew nation. In the texts the word "enemy" with its synonyms "foe" and "adversary" is used many times. Other military terms, occurring more or less frequently, are war, battle, bow, arrow, shield, buckler, net (like our wire), pit (trench), snare, gin, rock, tower, sword, rod of iron (mace), destroy, cut off lips and tongue, captivity, compass about, leap over the wall, fortress, troop, horses, chariots, host, bloody men, house of defense (castle or walled city), fight, curse, slay, wound, drive out, push down, tread under, spear, spearmen, army, lie in wait (ambush), divide the tongue (slit), dashing little ones against stones, desolation, washing feet in enemy's blood, casting into the fire (torture for treasure), burning coals fall on them (at a siege), poison, and others. Quite a list! But when one reviews the national career of the Hebrews, from the migration out of Ur to a distant land, through centuries of abject slavery, and a whole generation of wandering in deserts, through the moral, political, and economic confusion and civil strife of the period of the Judges, the bitter conflicts of a divided kingdom, the stress beneath the iron heels of the Babylonian, the Syrian, and the Egyptian, involving a whole lifetime of captivity among pagans, what wonder that we hear the wailing lamentations of a people suffering the deepest humiliation, rabid resentment, and a hopeless longing for deliverance! And yet out of the anguish of those bitter chastisements arose the sweetest songs that waft the soul up to God.

POETIC FORM

Our topic demands some reference to poetic form. Hebrew poetry presents the following chief features:

1. Beautiful imagery, including simile, metaphor, and allegory.

2. Literary figures, such as personification, hyperbole, rhetorical questions.
3. Irony.
4. Balance of thought or parallelism.
5. Concise and forceful diction.
6. Beauty of rhythm.

The last two can be appreciated best in the original Hebrew. But the English has done much in our Authorized Version to compensate the loss. The thought in Hebrew poetry is concentrated upon one dominant idea—the one true God, and man's relation to Him. This constitutes a majesty far superior to any other poetic expression. Jehovah the Creator "stretches out the heavens like a curtain" and "measures the universe with a span." He "feeds His flock like a shepherd and carries the lambs in His bosom." The classical poets, Greek and Roman, elaborate their figures into complete pictures. But the Hebrew in a few short balanced phrases, transcendent in outline, suggests the picture and leaves its completion to the spiritual imagination. Again we read "O my God, make them like the whirling dust, as stubble before the wind, as the fire that burneth the forest, as the flame that setteth the mountains on fire." The annihilation of the Assyrian army is like "the sudden disappearance of the grasshoppers which camp in the hedges in the cold day, but when the sun ariseth they flee away." Poetic parallelism is found also in the Proverbs, in Job, the Song of Songs, and in the Prophets. We also see it in historical narrative. For example, in Chronicles we read of how some champions forsook the army of King Saul and joined forces with David. He suspected treachery and informed them so, whereupon the story relates:

Then the spirit came upon Amasai, chief of the captains, and he said: Thine are we, David: and on thy side, thou son of Jessie; Peace, peace be unto thee: and peace be unto thy helpers; For thy God helpeth thee.

Doubtless much history has arisen or been perpetuated in songs. Poetic parallelism was not confined to the Hebrew singers.

It is seen in ancient Accadian verse which is supposed to antedate the time of Abraham:

Bless everything: and to my dress be favorable.

A heifer am I: to the cow I am yoked.

The fruit of death may the man eat: the fruit of life may he achieve.

IMAGERY

Imagery is the art of forming images in the mind. It is a kind of literary decoration. Imagery in literature presents truth picturesquely, concisely, vividly, memorably and emotionally. The more emotion stirs in a man the more his speech is likely to abound in figures—exclamation, interrogation, anacoluthon, apostrophe, hyperbole, simile, metaphor, imprecation, etc. The primary aim of the poetic mood is not clearness of logical statement, but force, vigor, intensity, so that the word expression may represent the inner frame of the mind. The singers of Israel, pouring out the fullness of their hearts in praise of Jehovah, seize upon every lovely and majestic image that comes within their ken. He is by turn a rock, a shield, a fortress, a horn (image of strength and pride), and light. Heaven is His throne, earth His footstool, the vault of the sky His tent. He walks upon the wings of the wind. But as might well be expected, it is in the rhapsodies of the Prophets that imagery abounds. This profusion culminates in the phantasmagory of St. John's Apocalypse. Hebrew imagery is a chromatic portraiture of their country, their history, their mountains, earthquakes, storms, cosmogony, occupations, agriculture, building, diseases, food, art, precious stones, royalty, furniture, zoology, seafaring, warfare, etc.

Leaving abstractions let us come to particulars. In Psalm 84 we read "The Lord God is a sun and shield." What is the rhetorical relation between the sun and a shield? There may not be any such relationship. Nor do I see here an indirect reference to a sun-god. As in Isaiah 60 Jehovah is the everlasting Light that will not go down. He is also the unfailing Protector, as

in Psalm 115. The writer in question may be leaping animatedly from one figure to another. However, there is a possible relationship. A warrior in combat might hold his metal shield in such position as to blind his foe's eyes with the reflection of the sun's rays. It was also the practice of both Jews and Romans to hang their shields with other trophies in their temples. The forceful imagery of the Psalms exhibits the moral nature of God as the Creator, Protector, Provider, Judge, Rewarder, Avenger, Redeemer, Executioner—and Warrior. He also *commissions* His followers as executors, or even executioners, of His judgments, as we read: "Let the saints be joyful in glory: let them sing aloud upon their beds. Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand: to execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgment written: this honor have all the saints. Praise ye the Lord." (Psalm 149.) Another: "Blessed be the Lord my strength, which teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight: my goodness, and my fortress; my high tower and my deliverer; my shield, and He in whom I trust; Who subdueth my people under me." Psalm 83, ascribed to Asaph, breathes out violence and slaughter against Israel's warlike neighbors who disputed the land with them, reminding us of the age-long quarrel between Jews and Arabs in Palestine today. Of course the ancients—as we do also—fought their battles in the names of their gods. Recall the war cry of Xenophon's ten thousand against Artaxerxes, "Zeus the Savior and Victory." While certain of the Hebrew songs are evidently victory hymns, some of them may have been chanted by choirs in battle to nerve the combatants on the plain before them. By personal observation during the World War I learned that religious people under stress sometimes become quite murderous. Even some of our clergy outdid David with less provocation. Between the Jews and all other peoples there seems to be an inherent cultural antipathy, and I thoroughly believe that the curses in their Psalms mean what they say. That nation advocated the cause of Jehovah, the one true God, against

a world of false gods and universal moral decay. It was *Israel contra mundum*, and in this war among the gods fortunately for our salvation Jehovah and a bare human remnant survived. When Israel forsook Jehovah she aligned herself with His enemies and monotheism was in danger of extinction. Selected to lead the way to man's redemption the people became fascinated with the allurements of idolatry and steeped in moral corruption; but not even the rod of the divine curse could save them from the retribution that overtook them. The tree of life was destroyed except the one "Branch" whom we call the Nazarene (Isaiah ch. 11; Zech. ch. 3, 6).

CONCLUSION

Blessing and cursing are the vocables which register the right and the wrong measured by the will of God. Or let us regard them as the obverse and reverse of the same coin—the coin which was current in the moral transactions of primitive times. The curse represented the inherent and inevitable blight upon evil. That blight might be death, disease, weakness, madness, perplexity, misery, bad luck, or any other adversity to which flesh is heir. And so the last verse of the Old Testament is a threatening curse. But the opening message of the New is "Blessed." The religion of the Old Testament taught that the man who dared only touch a sacred thing, such as the Ark of the Covenant or the holy mount, was cursed with death. The New teaches that anyone who touches sacred things, even the body of Christ, may live and be saved. So then *let us not look for Christian ethical concepts in the primitive morality of ancient tribes—which is reading history backward.*

If we study the religion, the ethics, the culture, and the national traditions of ancient Judaism; if we sense the madness of the everlasting wars that sacked their cities, killed or wounded their best men, ravished their women, and murdered their babies, followed by pestilence, famine, economic confusion, and desolation of land and sanctuary, so that they feared national annihilation and the desertion of the God who alone could help them; and

realizing how for generations they had been debauched by weak and godless rulers—I say, reviewing all these facts and forces, what other appeal could those ill-starred tribes make than utter frenzied cries to all the powers in the upper and nether world to curse the bloody, idolatrous hordes that almost brought them to extinction? When, O when would Messiah appear?

Verily, the strings of David's harp gave forth many dulcet tones, but some of them contained much iron.¹

1 My purpose is obviously not to commend the practice of cursing by the recitation of superstitious formulas to blight an enemy, or to serve as a vehicle of explosive anger; but to study a moral and religious factor that runs throughout Old Testament history from Paradise to the threat in the last verse of Malachi, and as the fortissimo of many Hebrew songs. This essay is not a homily, but an historical study such as one would pursue when approaching the topic of human sacrifice in the story of Abraham and Isaac, or the practice of polygamy, or the extirpation of whole tribes of foreigners, or the Mosaic command to chant formularies of curses and blessings. Read Deuteronomy 27. Substantially and deplorably, Christian nations today are launching at one another with every detonation of their high-powered artillery—but not *pro Christo!*

DID LUTHER FOLLOW OCKHAM OR PAUL?

JOHN O. EVJEN

Carthage, Illinois

IN THE popular literature that mentions Ockham and Luther in the same breath, one can sometimes encounter statements like the following: "Ockham, the man who set Luther thinking," "Ockham was the forerunner of Luther inasmuch as Luther took over Ockham's doctrine of ubiquity and carried it further," or "In Ockham's doctrine that popes and councils may err and that only Scripture is infallible we already perceive the fundamental statement which became the strength of Luther." No doubt the purpose of these statements is to show that Luther did not stand alone among great scholars, that in Ockham he had one of the most important representatives of Scholasticism on his side, and that Luther was not an innovator or a revolutionary.

The Englishman William of Ockham was the most influential theologian in the fourteenth century. His significance in the field of theology, church law, and philosophy was incontestably great. He was just as much a philosopher as a theologian and just as much a theologian as an ecclesiastico-political writer. He lived about 1300 to 1350, and did his teaching first in the University of Oxford. The claim that he was a pupil of Duns Scotus and and was for some time active in Paris lacks proof. But he was of the Scotist tendency. From England he was brought to Avignon, accused of fifty-one heresies. Here he was in prison from 1324 to 1328. In 1328 he fled to Louis of Bavaria, whose court theologian he became. He wrote his sharp ecclesiastico-political treatises in Munich. He taught that the papal power had to do only with temporal matters, and that in secular matters the pope was under the jurisdiction of the emperor, that the emperor was elected by the electors and did not need papal confirmation; and that the Scriptures are above pope and council, both of which could err.

Nothing is definitely known as to whether or how much Luther was acquainted with Ockham's ecclesiastico-political writings. But he knew his other writings. As a student and young teacher, Luther studied Ockham's works. How could he help it? Luther's teachers in philosophy in the University of Erfurt were Trutvetter and Usingen. They represented Ockham's *via moderna* against the *via antiqua* of the Thomists. Also Nathin, Luther's teacher of theology in the little theological school which the monastery conducted at Erfurt independently of the University, was an Ockhamist.

Working through the *Sentences* (Dogmatics) of Peter Lombard, Luther early made use of the works of Ockham and of Biel and d'Ailly, disciples of Ockham. His understanding of Peter Lombard agreed at the time with that of Ockham. He also studied Augustine through the spectacles of Ockham, and made Africa's greatest theologian a nominalist or a terminist, though Augustine was a realist. He even went so far as to commit the mistake of making Augustine the chief representative of Ockham's theory of knowledge, which was a forerunner of Kant's doctrine about the "thing in itself." He called the English theologian "my dear master Ockham." Even as late as in 1532 he regarded this master as "the greatest dialectician," a statement which must refer to the latter's formal logic and not to evangelical theology, which was entirely foreign to the *doctor singularis et invincibilis*, as Ockham was called.

In his earlier years Luther swung his scientific-theological battleax, guided by the teachings of Ockham. And to the very last he could not detach himself entirely from Scholastic remnants. It is true that he frequently spoke harshly of Scholastic logic. But this did not mean an eternal farewell to it. Others—men of neo-Scholastic views—also criticised the old logic, which constitutes only a disappearing part of philosophy and means little in comparison with the theory of knowledge. However, Luther gradually liberated himself from Scholastic thinking: from the Old (Thomism), which never got a real hold upon him, as well as from the New (Ockhamism), though never completely.

Hence we have the peculiar phenomenon that Luther's evangelical conceptions are often set forth with the aid of Scholastic concepts and a Scholastic apparatus, in which the ray of the Gospel is broken or bent in the prism and reflected in a play of colors. Even with us everything spiritual is treated in a prismatic way when the purpose is to present a matter by the help of words. But especially does this take place when we treat the Scholastic, which marches along on the assumption of being intensely intellectual.

This also appears in Luther's theological reasons for his conception of the Lord's Supper. What he wanted to appear prominent, namely what was in harmony with his totalitarian conception of the Gospel, he was not able to make clear in this connection. The theoretical substructure which he presented caused a strife which has raged for several centuries and still is the most powerful "church-separating" factor in Protestant America—even in Lutheran circles in America which are inclined to hold the opinion that they are the only justified "guardians of the grail" whenever the doctrine of ubiquity is asserted. In thinking that the struggle concerns the conservation of evangelical truth, which Luther wanted to assert against Zwingli, the struggle really concerns a dried-up Scholastic theoretical mode of reasoning which only those can support who "do not think," or who "think" in pre-Kantian ways. In spite of honest and laudable opposition entertained in many serious circles against the materialistic conception of history and against the mechanization of life, there still are not a few in these circles who spend their lives in a refined form of the Middle Ages. Such people thrive as undisturbed under the sceptre of Ockham as under the leadership of Luther since they are not aware of the difference. And therefore we hear such assertions as were quoted in the beginning of this article. But if we speak of Ockham as a Christian man spiritually related to Luther, we must make known that with respect to those things which were of ultimate value for Luther, the Reformer from Wittenberg owed nothing whatever to the man of Oxford and Munich.

First, it was not that man from England who set Luther "athinking." There were hundreds of theologians who were Ockhamists and never became evangelical thinkers. The majority of German theologians were Ockhamists; some say one-third, others say two-thirds. But how few of them became Luther's friends in the struggle for the Gospel! One only need remember how angry Trutvetter became when Luther defended his evangelical Theses at the disputation at Heidelberg. When Luther visited Erfurt on the way home he called on his old teacher, who later wrote a letter to him which flashed lightning and made all further companionship between the two impossible. Also Usingen and Nathin, who had taught Luther in the spirit of Ockham, now stood aloof. The person who "set Luther thinking" was Paul of Tarsus. From Paul Luther got his *evangelical* thinking; Ockham was a formalist and a Catholic to his fingertips.

Secondly, it was not Ockham who gave Luther the doctrine of ubiquity. It must, however, be concluded that on the formal side Luther was influenced by Ockham—for example, in the division of the local presence of Christ's body and its existence (outside of space) in the Lord's Supper and in all that exists. Here Ockham was the source. But the difference between the teaching of the two men about the omnipresence of Christ is profound. For Ockham the real body of Christ is in heaven. For Luther it is omnipresent because of the *communicatio idiomatum*. Luther's teaching is religiously motivated. Ockham's teaching is only a philosophical hypothesis, an impassionate calculation. Luther taught that the selfsame Christ who had obtained grace and the forgiveness of sins for man is present in the Lord's Supper in order to convince the believer about his redemption. He asks: "What is now the difference? Yes, what is better: that one with the soul eats flesh and bones or that one eats with the mouth?"

Luther's view is this: Just as we receive Christ by the proclamation of the Word, so we receive Him also in the Lord's Supper, where the Word is the chief thing. For, in the eyes of Luther, the Word was primary; the Sacrament was secondary; the latter

was what it was by virtue of the Word. Primitive Christianity had the same view. But for the Catholics—from the year 100 and upwards—the Sacrament was the superordinate, and the Word a subordinate thing. The Sacrament was ritualized action on part of the church, performed by the bishop, who at his ordination as bishop received a new gift of grace which alone enabled him to impart the Spirit. The Word spoken by a layman did not impart the Spirit, did not regenerate. Only the Sacrament was Spirit-imparting. For this reason the Sacrament was so highly respected in the Middle Ages. For Luther, however, the Word was as Spirit-imparting as was the Sacrament. Therefore he could not but resent the attitude of Zwingli, for whom the Sacrament was a mere symbol for something absent or something to come. The Wittenberg Reformer regarded the Sacrament as “a form for what is present and invisible.” The main thing for Luther was that the historical Redeemer, the Saviour, was Himself present and did not come merely by the use of fantasy.

In order to substantiate this, Luther made use of Scholastic material. But it was only a means for an end, and not the only means. The explanation which Scholasticism offered was only a *possible* explanation. It did not exclude other possibilities. But it was an error to resort to Scholastic logic, for this logic did not aid truth; it placed obstacles in its way. When Luther wrote against, and disputed with, Zwingli and the latter’s defenders, he emphasized the presence of Christ in the Lord’s Supper. Entirely with justice. He desired that Zwingli should perceive how *religiously* true this was. But Zwingli, whose chief aim was not the establishment of a religious truth and the union on the basis of it, but to form a martial alliance of Protestant states, Switzerland at the head of it, against the Catholics, avoided the *religious* elements in the presentation offered by Luther and set off for the woods of Scholasticism.

And now he got the chastisement which any one may receive who is not acquainted in a large forest. He walked in circles, lost. Zwingli was a Renaissance thinker. Scholasticism had never been on his school menu. But Luther had received this food as

daily bread for many years. No Zwingli could or should teach him by using the Scholastic apparatus as an aid. With all his Scholastic superiority Luther attacked Zwingli and proved that his (Luther's) *religious* viewpoint could be defended even by means of *Scholasticism*. In order to make clear *that* Christ was present in the Lord's Supper, he now wanted to prove *how* he was present. Here Luther made free with proofs that could not weather intellectual storms. The Scholastic proof was too weak, and could not be anything but weak. We well know that the existence of the spiritual does not depend on syllogisms, but if possible far less on the syllogisms used in the Middle Ages.

Zwingli and his theological following at Marburg had tried to defend the "Reformed" conception of the Lord's Supper as a plain commemorating meal, without Christ's presence. They played with the fire of Scholasticism. Luther replied with the same fire. As a trained Scholastic he handled Zwingli with reckless superiority. Bucer wept at Marburg because of the defeat of the Swiss, which defeat consisted in the fact that Luther was too *religious* to agree to a political alliance intended to employ physical force against the Catholics. Religiously Luther was the fair-minded man at Marburg; Zwingli was the obstinate one.¹

The "Marburg Articles" were the result of this meeting. Luther wrote them. They were signed both by Luther and by Zwingli as well as by their theological followers present at the Marburg Colloquy. Luther's original proposition that it should be left open for each one to determine *how* Christ was present was rejected by Zwingli, who feared political trickery. So little did he know the honest heart of his opponent. Luther met Zwingli more than half way during this Marburg disputation. Later research has proved that the "hard-headed" man at Marburg was Zwingli, not Luther. Luther's Scholastic equipment was, however, held in reserve at Marburg. He made a fuller use of it

1 See the documents constituting the Protocol of the Colloquy at Marburg in 1529 in the *Weimar edition* of Luther's Works, Vol. 30, iii; reprinted in *Die Christliche Welt*, July 21, 1927.

subsequently in his longer writings about the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

Thirdly, it was not Ockham's teaching with regard to the Scriptures which became the "Lutheran Scriptural principles." As has already been mentioned, Ockham assigns a higher place to Scripture than to either pope or councils. But this was not a new teaching. The supremacy of Scripture was never questioned in the Oriental church, which never established a papacy. Ockham regarded the Bible as an object of faith. In the Bible he found the positive expression of the will of God. Only Scripture could authoritatively establish what the content of faith was to be. The Bible was inspired, word for word! Indeed, it contained, asserted Ockham, many things that were contrary to reason; but reason had nothing to say respecting questions of faith. Ockham, it is true, surrendered his belief in canon law and in the legal authority of the pope. But there was nothing particularly evangelical in this surrender; for he substituted an authority which was just as legalistic—the Bible. The Bible became a legal (not evangelical) authority. This meant the creation of a new canonical legal instance, the legalizing of the Bible into a statute for man's personal relation with God, which thus had to become a legal relation. The Bible became a law book instead of a revelation.

It was heresy for Ockham not to believe every single word of the Bible. According to this Luther would have been a heretic because he doubted the authenticity of the Epistle of James and the Revelation of John. Luther had a different conception of heresy. Heresy, according to Luther, was to interpret Scripture in another manner than the Holy Ghost did. To the Reformer Scripture was binding to the extent that it proclaimed Christ, the Gospel, or pointed to Christ. Many historical matters in the Bible did not concern Christian life.

Thus Ockham's evaluation of Scripture as *jus divinum*, as divinely inspired, does not express Luther's *religious* understanding of the Bible, however much he was obliged to use it as a criterion in his struggle for the new church. He therefore said

that whatever proclaimed Christ was apostolic, even if Judas, Annas, Pilate, and Herod proclaimed it. God's Word as means of *grace* is not, according to Luther, identical with the graphically established Word of revelation in Holy Writ; but it is every spoken or written word in which God's will, or God's presence is made known—for example, in preaching, instruction, and cure of souls, all of which is an application of the revelation of salvation contained in the basic words of Scripture. Luther surrendered the ecclesiastico-legal conception of Scripture for the *religious* conception of it. Scripture was for him the test for all ecclesiastical doctrine; but it was this as an expression of experienced revelation from God.

Among the Ockhamists there had also been a start towards evaluating the respective books of the Bible. Thus d'Ailly, the Frenchman, distinguished between the Old and the New Testament. But the Ockhamists made but little practical use of the Bible. Ockham finds no express teaching in the Bible about transubstantiation. He says that he knows of another conception (consubstantiation) which is even better, and this teaching is not contradicted by the Bible. But Ockham felt greater allegiance to the church than to the Bible: what the church taught was right. He was the spokesman for ecclesiastical positivism. His conception of Christianity was not evangelical.

It is possible to speak of the merits of Ockham in regard to the subsequent Reformation. But these merits were of the negative order. They did not create anything new. He attacked old Scholasticism with a new Scholasticism. He could not have done anything else. Things ancient had become a part of the blood of the people. Dante's great work shows this. But things ecclesiastical were now increasingly made the object of suspicion among thinking people. There were attempts to separate between the spiritual and the secular. Ockham united in his person the sceptical and critical tendencies of his age. But he remained to the very last an apologist for the existing things in the church. He united critical radicalism with practical conservatism, a combination not uncommon to Englishmen.

Therefore Ockham could be true to the Roman Church and defend transubstantiation, but also atomize everything possible. Nothing could be immune to logical analysis. His dexterity in dialectical technique was astonishing. He took up his position with *potentia absoluta* and proved the positive in all formulas. He went to childish extremes in his play with logic. But through this he contributed to the undermining of antiquated methods of logic. The relativistic in the theological formulas was now revealed everywhere.

He presented a new theory of knowledge which raises a structure on understanding and experience. He was a Nominalist, teaching that universal concepts like wood, horse, etc., are formed by the aid of abstract thinking; they do not exist; they are mere names (*nomina*); only individual things exist; the Universal is a fiction of the understanding, though not an arbitrary figment.

Ockham maintains that science in its broadest meaning, embracing all organized knowledge, has nothing to do with concrete things, but only with concepts and statements of the understanding. Scientific statements can not be made of ox and donkey. And the concepts of soul and body, in union, can not create a living being. Abstractions teem in Ockham's system of thinking. They thrive as thistles. Since natural thinking never leads to the goal, Ockham recommends religion. Religion lies on a higher level than thought. There is a large wall of separation between religion and knowledge. He argues:

God exists. And this must be believed. But His existence can, strictly speaking, not be proved. The soul is immortal; this is a matter of faith, for the immortality of the soul cannot be proved. Logical syllogisms can not prove religious truths. Articles of faith are *per se* incapable of being proved. The dogmas of the church can not be proved to be necessary. If God assumed another nature, a statement for the purpose of proving this would also be necessary. It would accordingly not be illogical to say that God is stone, or that the Father and the Spirit were born of Mary, just as Jesus was born of her. Indeed, on the basis of the *communicatio idiomatum* it would not at all do violence

to logic to say that God is the foot of Christ or that the foot is the hand!

It can readily be seen why Ockham combated the logical necessity of ecclesiastical life and "proved" the logical possibility of another doctrine. He does not hesitate to say that God could just as well have commanded man to hate God as to love Him, or to steal and commit adultery. In other words, articles of faith oppose the considerations made by the understanding. From the viewpoint of understanding, the contrary can also be proved. In order to prove all this Ockham presents a tremendously complete critical apparatus. But his idea was not to mock the teachings of the church or to sow seeds of suspicion against it. He only wished to show that the understanding has nothing to do with the truths of understanding, but only with given positive truths.

We shall later examine how much or how little this recurs in the writings of Luther.

In the meantime we can here inquire, What did Ockham mean by faith, and what did Luther mean? Here the difference between these two men is exceedingly great. According to Luther, faith is the work of God in and through man. It designates the real relation between God and man in which the emphasis falls on God, who is the all-working and all-determining One. Subjectively seen, faith is the courageous yes to God's call. God constrains (not compels) us.² For Ockham, faith is an acknowledgment of the doctrine which is found in the three ecclesiastical symbols. Faith is founded on three motives: Man believes because he feels inwardly impelled to do so; because the church prescribes faith; and because Scripture is inspired. This faith is *infused* into man (*fides infusa*). Luther rejected this conception of faith because faith for him was a matter of the heart. In the purely religious sphere Luther stands on different ground than Ockham.

The Roman Catholic Denifle has attempted to make Ockham Luther's chief teacher. But this attempt has met with no more

² Melanchthon departs from Luther in calling faith the "organ for receiving and possessing faith." Orthodoxism follows Melanchthon.

success than similar other attempts to give this honor to Wiclif or Augustine or Staupitz or Bernhard of Clairvaux or Tauler. It is true that Luther learned a little from all of these men whose religious life-view belonged to the Middle Ages. But in reality he had no teacher who taught the *evangelical* view of life. In order to get this he had to go back to Paul, whom no theologian in 1400 years had been able to understand, that apostle who really knew what "grace" and "faith" meant.

We have stated that Luther in the first years of his manhood was an Ockhamist, but as the years passed he liberated himself more and more from the influence of Ockham. Only here and there were remnants left. Karl Holl, a leading Luther authority, claims that Luther in later years *mocked* Ockham. Otto Scheel has correctly refuted this claim, but points out that after the great turn in Luther's life when he "saw the light" (1512-1513), he shelved Ockham most of the time in matters that were purely religious. Scheel's magnificent study of Luther has not gone beyond 1515. It thus gives no information about the Luther-Zwingli controversy respecting the Lord's Supper.

It will be informing to consider the results which have been arrived at by men like Th. Brieger, Heinrich Böhmer, Karl Heim, and Reinhold Seeberg, Albert Hauck, and Gustaf Aulen.

Professor *Theodor Brieger*, of the University of Leipzig, who at his death in 1915 was considered the greatest living authority on the history of the Reformation, wrote in his grand work, *Die Reformation*, substantially this:

To every one who with the eyes of an unprejudiced historian is able to survey the development of Luther's views with respect to the Lord's Supper, there can today be no question that the Reformer got into a wrong road in the controversy about the Lord's Supper, and yet was right in the essential. He deviated, though only gently and almost unnoticed, from the fundamental view of the Lord's Supper which was demanded by his Reformation principle. According to his original basic view, the Sacrament is another *form* of the Word of God. This offers consolation to sinners about the forgiveness of God, and, like the Word, exclusively affects faith.

He deviated from this basic view, which he never could abandon (we meet it again and again), in that he, in order to defend the significance of the Sacrament, a significance misjudged by the opponents, permitted himself to be carried away so as to secure for the Sacrament a *special effect*, an effect which did not belong to the Word. The Sacrament was thus, by its imparting of the body of Christ, to place the recipient of the Supper into a specially intimate and mysterious connection with Christ. Without wanting to do so, he again introduced something of the Catholic view which ascribes to the Sacrament a mystical-magic effect. This caused no little harm to Protestantism, which because of the narrow views of the *epigoni* perceived itself hurled into irreparable confusion. For Luther, however, this was only a wrong road towards the *right goal*. He was entirely superior to his opponents in what lay closest to his heart.

Zwingli had separated the Sacrament from that which, in its religious purpose, was the most valuable; for Zwingli's theology here remained wrapped up in the neo-Platonic Humanism with which he earlier had become acquainted. He regarded the Lord's Supper as nothing else than an act performed by believers and not as performed by God. In turning his weapons against this outrage upon the Sacrament, Luther did not defend any special doctrinal opinion, in itself unimportant, or a question which belonged only to the realm of theology. He regarded it as something fundamental; that is, as something that was more closely related to what was central in his conception of religious totality.

Heinrich Böhmer, a prominent authority on Luther, was of the same opinion, but spoke with less reservation. He said that Luther called the Ockhamists "sow-theologians," but he never was able to rid himself of them entirely. To some extent he remained an Ockhamist all his life. Indeed, in some of his teachings he must be considered (Denifle's claim) an *epigonus* who continued the work of Ockham.

What he [Luther] taught about the Lord's Supper and the omnipresence of the body of Christ, and what he, in this controversy concerning this doctrine, presented with regard to concepts, proofs, and analogies—this can be directly traced back to Ockham, d'Ailly, and Biel. Indeed, it seems as if he had the profound feeling that he could carry off the palm in this controversy, if he did it as an Ockhamist. Without reservation he repeatedly asserted in his polemics the Ockhamistic conception of revelation as a sum of doctrines which contradict reason. And just as unconditionally as Ockham did, he demanded, in the name of faith, that reason be made a

captive and man must blindly submit to all 'pieces' of the Christian doctrine.

But not only in regard to this particular point, and not only in regard to those documents which people have later been wont to regard as the "arch-Lutheran dogmas," does he prove himself to be a true disciple of Ockham. He is a disciple of Ockham in the following matters: In keeping absolutely secret what is confessed and what is counseled in the Confessional; permission of the white lie; his doctrine about the laws of nature and rights of nature; the secular governments' relation to natural law and written law; the right of the secular government to champion religious reform; his disparagement of jurists and jurisprudence; and, above all, the conviction which he maintained to his last breath that reason is entirely incapable of knowing the mysteries of faith.

Nevertheless, Böhmer flatly rejects Father Denifle's dismissal of Luther as a dried-up Ockhamist.

For, if we consider the basic religious ideas in Luther's preaching, his view about evil and sin, the forgiveness of sins, grace, law and Gospel, piety as a religious relation and as a moral relation, we easily perceive that Luther fought his way through to these fundamental ideas in a *struggle against Ockham's theology*. *His theology, therefore, is something entirely different from a dried-up or mollified Ockhamism.* It is rather, in all of its essential traits, *the most complete contrast to Ockhamism.*

Böhmer, however, does not overlook that Ockham and his school had worked out certain concepts and formulas which Luther indeed made use of, but which he filled with evangelical content. For example, the hollow concept of "non-accountability of sins" he filled with a new content. The concepts of "grace" and "justification" were retained by Ockham, but they were exhausted. These also received a new life in Luther's system. According to Biel, God's change of mind is a result of man's change of mind. According to Luther, man's change of mind is wrought by God (faith).

As far as the doctrine about hierarchy and the monarchical church government was concerned, Ockham had also written much about that. But Scripture stood above this, and Scripture, he held, was alone inerrant. "But the Bible was in the opinion of Ockham an accidental mixture of oracles, which contradicted

reason." The church, he believed, should be the proper interpreter of these oracles. But, then, the teachings of the church, too, had to be interpreted. This interpretation, again, was to be found in Ockham's own teaching about redemption. "Hence Ockham was not a Biblicist. And he could never have made Luther a Biblicist. . . . If Luther had followed Ockham, the Bible would always have remained for him a book with seven seals; and he would never have arrived at the idea, seriously and unbiased, establishing what the Sacred Book really says." Not before the Reformer understood the Bible and was entirely assured in his new interpretation, did the teaching of the Ockhamists about the Bible attain a certain significance for him, but this was entirely due to their negative consequences; that is, due to their polemics against the infallibility of the pope and the councils.

Luther was benefited by the *negative* criticism presented by the Ockhamists. This criticism made it easier for him to settle accounts with the ancient faith. Ockham's apparatus of concepts was very well suited to the new presentation; but the Ockhamists are not responsible for Luther's *evangelical* conviction. He did not receive it from them. He gained it, and had to gain it again, in continuous conflict with them. At most they had pointed to Augustine as the greatest of all theologians.

There was, however, a tragic element in Luther. The tragical did not consist in the fact that he made use of these forms, nor in the fact that he had not entirely liberated himself from this theologian ballast. What was tragic, says Böhmer, was Luther's obstinacy. This was revealed in the controversy with Zwingli about the Lord's Supper. Brieger's judgment is thus confirmed by that of Böhmer.

"Luther, as all other great Christians, felt the ardent need not only to *think* the personal fellowship with his Lord and Master, but also to *experience* it in the Lord's Supper. Zwingli did not feel this need. Luther did not appear with a new doctrine, but in order to ward off the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists (spokesmen for the symbolical conception of the Lord's Supper), he made a step backward and took up his position with the ancient

Scholastic theories. In the heat of the conflict he became obdurate in these antiquated doctrinal opinions, which did not fit his new religious views at all.

Therewith a genuine trait from the Middle Ages again entered into his theology, a weft from the ancient nature-stressed conception about "essence" and the operation of grace, which was regarded as bound to purely material (*dinglich*) transactions. For the Middle Ages were not capable of conceiving the spiritual as purely spiritual. It also regarded God as a "substance" and grace as celestial matter.

That Luther never acknowledged this mistake, and never wanted to acknowledge it, turned out fateful for himself, for the future, and for his life work. Especially because of this, he repelled the freest, most courageous, and most pious minds. Through this—and that weighs still more—he left a vulnerable place in the still incomplete defensive system of the new church. This vulnerable place was used by interrelated families of theologians and jurists in the following generations for smuggling in all possible kinds of antiquities.

Among these antiquities were: the Catholic conception of the ministry, Thomas Aquinas' first principles and moral theology, the Scholastic method and the casuistic treatment of ethics, Suarez's metaphysics, and even canon law which Luther had passionately shown the door. Finally the undignified condition was brought about to which Samuel Puffendorf applied the lash with stinging mockery—that state of affairs when Lutheran scholarship unblushingly went as a guest to its mortal enemies, the Jesuits. This has been called Luther's "tragic *guilt*." Böhmer says the more appropriate word is "tragic *innocence*," and adds that the tragical does not always end in a violent catastrophe, but sometimes can reveal itself outwardly in a creeping crisis.

The tragedy in Luther consisted, first, in the *internal* contradiction in which he got entangled because of the sacramental controversy. He got into conflict with the new religious views which he had achieved in heated battles. Secondly, the tragedy consisted in the blind zeal and the strong obstinacy by which he lost his way in an entirely antiquated doctrine, in order to defend a view dear to him. Not once did he ask whether this formal teaching did not threaten his most sacred conviction and whether there were not other ways in which he could help this view to come to its own rights.

This passionate power, which formerly was bridled with a clear understanding of the most essential and real and thus had impelled him to go victoriously forward, now forced him back, his vision blurred. And though this sudden reverse did not lead to a catastrophe (it did later, in the case of his favorite pupil Flacius who was much of the same mind), it did cause a state of inertia in his spiritual interests. In the course of events this stagnation of the evangelical movement increased in the protective dams which Orthodox Lutheranism constructed and which finally came too close to one another.

More gentle are the words of *Reinhold Seeberg* concerning the Reformers' relation to the teachings of Ockhamism about the Lord's Supper:

Luther himself knew that these explanations should only be regarded as *possibilities*, which did not exclude other possibilities. . . . Ockham's work *De Sacramento Altaris* is of importance here insofar as some traits in it have entered Luther's teaching concerning the Lord's Supper. Above everything else, the matter hinges about the possibility that Christ's body, which is in one place in heaven, can at the same time, according to the will of God, be present in various places—the so-called "*esse diffinitum*." But it seems to me that Luther's relation to Ockham with regard to this has been strongly overestimated. In the main Luther had in mind the body of Christ as omnipresent, and makes use of the "diffinitive" being in order to make clear, also in another way, to Zwingli and his associates the possibility of Christ's physical presence in the Lord's Supper.

It is our duty to listen to the evangelical Luther and not to follow him where he erred or was unable to keep himself on the height of his life view. He was not infallible.

We have listened to Seeberg, Scheel, Brieger, and Böhmer. A word finally from *Karl Heim*, whom Professor Ihlen in Norway regards as one of the leading theologians of our age. Heim applies Luther's teaching concerning the Sacrament of Baptism to his teaching concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and arrives at the following conclusion:

With regard to baptism, Luther at the first attack vanquished the ancient conception of the Sacrament and arrived at the new unadulterated concep-

tion of the Sacrament as sponsored by Protestantism. It took him longer to arrive at the corresponding conception respecting the Lord's Supper. In the controversy about the latter, Luther is like a wrestler who in wrestling with a strong opponent permits himself to be forced back a few steps behind the line. In his struggle with Spiritualists like Zwingli and Carlstadt, he let himself be pushed back and found himself standing on mediaeval ground.

This falling-back did not consist in the defense he put up against the Swiss opponents by using the formula that the body and the blood of Christ are received "in, with, and under" bread and wine. This could be understood as being in harmony with the Reformation. He left the track, however, when he made the statement that unbelievers also receive, in these elements, the true body and blood of Christ, although to their own condemnation.

As soon as there was even a possibility of thinking that a person without faith in the Word received heavenly nourishment, the sacred *thing* re-enters, the consecrated host charged with celestial powers. A person can then get in contact with heavenly forces by another way than by faith alone and in the conscience alone under the impression of the Word—by eating the host.

We must therefore, if we desire to remain Protestants, correct Luther's conception of the Lord's Supper according to his teaching respecting baptism. We must say just the same thing about bread and wine as Luther said about the water. If we separate the Word from it and faith, which can adhere to the Word alone, then bread in the Lord's Supper is no other kind of bread than is the bread purchased at the baker's; and wine in the Lord's Supper is no other kind of wine than the wine consumed at home.

I must add that Professor Paul Althaus, of Erlangen, claims that the derailing consists in the words of Heim and not in those of Luther. Althaus is a systematician, like Heim, but more a high church, ecclesiastical positivist in Protestant dress, rejecting neo-Lutheranism but still following in its steps.

We arrive at the following result. If we remove the scholastic dress from Luther's teaching about the Lord's Supper, and take up the position that he held in his first Reformation years, we shall have the Protestant conception of the Sacrament which teaches the *presence* of the *person* of Christ in the Sacrament (which is another form of the Word). In the *Word* we have fellowship with the person of Christ. Likewise in the Sacrament. This fellowship, or communion, is not institutionally mediated as in the Catholic Church; it is mediated *personally*. Luther wanted to em-

phasize the personal. He could, therefore, always say that the presence of body and blood includes, in regard to the unity of person, the personal fellowship of Christ.

If Luther had known, what we now think we know, that the Greek word for body (*soma*) means in Scripture what we call "person," he would have applied stronger brakes to the Scholastic methods of proof which he used. In Old German "body" has the same meaning as in Greek. The English words "anybody," "somebody," "everybody" are due to the same usage. Compare the Norwegian "vulgar" expression, *Hvad var det den kroppen vilde?* (What was it that that body wanted?) "Person" is now a modern definite term, though older than "personality," the latter word having been created by Goethe. In Dogmatics the word "person" is generally used in a symbolic meaning. The purpose of its use is to ward off the danger of considering God as an abstract idea or as a natural being. The expression "person," says Gustaf Aulen, the Swedish theologian, did not have, at the time when the doctrine of the Trinity was being formulated, the meaning which later centuries have allotted to it. It did not possess the full and fixed significance of independent individuality which it possesses today. He indicates how indefinite and fluctuating the use of the word "person" was in the ancient church, and he further says, If we should make it clear to the men of the ancient church what we in our times designate by "person" and "personality," there would be no doubt that these church fathers would refuse us the right of applying our concept of person to the Trinitarian formula. If we should do this, they would judge us severely as tritheistic heretics.

As to the idea of *soma*, meaning person, my attention was called to this through an interview which Dr. S. G. Hefelbower had (about 1900) with Albert Hauck, the church historian. It was later used in the same meaning by R. Seeberg in one of his books. In reviewing this work in 1907 for *The Lutheran Observer* I noted this use. Twenty years later, Dr. Uhl, referring to this review, said that he was struck by the similarity of the Greek usage of *soma* with the usage of the corresponding word in India.

The main objective of Luther was not to furnish a rational proof, and not at all a Scholastic "proof." Behind the "proof" we shall have to look for the *motive*. It does not depend on the *form* of presentation, but on the *motive*. Luther followed two main motives. First, he held firmly to the fact that the Lord's Supper is a means of grace. For Zwingli it was an act of commemoration. Second, in emphasizing the presence of the body, Luther desired to emphasize how the divine revelation of love and the work of reconciliation take place and have taken place *in history*, in the world of humanity, in the corporal world. For Zwingli, again, there existed an opposition between spirit and flesh; he had that from the Greeks. For Luther the opposition was not the spiritual and the bodily, but God's Holy Spirit and what is sinful. God's revelation takes place *in history*. There is nothing implied here about spiritualism or idealism.

For Luther, there was a question neither about symbolism nor about realism. The question was about Christ's "effective presence." As Aulen says: "If we wish to speak of a presence in a sensuous meaning, this would not mean any higher degree of presence, but rather a lower one. The fellowship that believers have with Christ is not realized through any purely external connection with Christ, but through His spiritual, effective presence. The spiritual presence is in the eyes of faith the supreme form of presence; yes, it is, in its unsearchable mysteriousness, the only real, creative, and life-giving presence."

The Lord's Supper is the Christian's great festival of joy. It is not a funeral worship, not a mass for the dead, and it is not a church-separating locus in Dogmatics. It is the Sacrament of suffering and victorious love. Its characteristic motives are remembrance, surrender, fellowship, and the spiritual sacrifice of gratitude (Aulen). Wherever the Lord's Supper is a mark of church separation, it is a caricature. It is then not the *Lord's* Supper but *men's* supper, a man-made affair. When God bestows His blessing in such arrangements made by men, he does so not because of these arrangements but in spite of them. Here especially the invocation is needed: "Marana tha; Lord, come. Amen."

PASTORAL HEROISM IN A TIME OF PANIC: HELMUTH AND THE YELLOW FEVER EPIDEMIC IN PHILADELPHIA, 1793

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

FOR the Lutherans in Philadelphia the three months of late summer and early fall in the year 1793 were harrowing months of appalling distress. Swarms of unsuspected mosquitoes carried on their wings the dreaded scourge of yellow fever and introduced tragedy into the homes of the people. Philadelphia had been visited before by similar epidemics in 1699, in 1741, in 1762, and in 1780. But never before, and never since, was the mortality so high or the panic so great.

It was August 5, 1793, when Dr. Benjamin Rush, the leading physician in Philadelphia, recorded the first case of yellow fever. Within two weeks the number of cases had increased to such an extent that he became alarmed. On August 21 Henry Helmuth,¹ the pastor of Zion Lutheran Church, recorded in his Diary² that he had observed "much anxiety here and there on account of a supposed pestilential disease." The next day he added that "the people in Water Street are in great distress. Dr. Nolck told me that it is yellow fever. Sixteen have already been buried in this neighborhood during the last few days."

1 Justus Christian Heinrich Helmuth is one of the most neglected figures in the early history of the Lutheran Church in America. Educated in the University of Halle, Germany, he came to America in 1769 at the age of twenty-four. The first ten years of his ministry in America were spent in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. In 1779 he was called to Zion Lutheran Church in Philadelphia, and he served this congregation as senior pastor until his retirement, because of the infirmities of age, in 1820. Five years later, just before his eightieth birthday, he died. A popular preacher, a devoted pastor, a tutor of students for the ministry, an editor and author, his life was one of constant and fruitful activity. When the University of Pennsylvania conferred on him the honorary degrees of Master of Arts (1780) and Doctor of Divinity (1785), it expressed the high regard in which Helmuth was held in his community. There are brief sketches of Helmuth's life in C. R. Demme, *The Christian Minister's Last Honor from a Christian Congregation* (Philadelphia: 1825); M. L. Stoevers, in *The Evangelical Review*, VI (1854), 2-10; W. B. Sprague, ed., *Annals of the American Lutheran Pulpit* (New York: 1869), 51-54; and in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, VIII, 515-516.

2 Helmuth's Diary comprises ninety manuscript volumes, most of them small, and covers the years 1767 to 1810. The handwriting is an exceedingly cramped German script. Volumes 22 and 23 deal with the period of the yellow fever epidemic. These volumes provide the major source for the present study. Because of their abundance specific references to the Diary will not be cited below. The manuscript Diary is located in the archives of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia.

All kinds of curious speculations were advanced in an attempt to explain the origin of the disease. The most popular opinion appears to have been that it came from a noisome odor emitted by a shipload of decomposing coffee in the harbor. "Its smell was highly putrid and offensive," wrote Rush, "insomuch that the inhabitants of the houses in Water and Front Streets, who were near it, were obliged in the hottest weather to exclude it by shutting their doors and windows. . . . The rapid progress of the fever from Water Street, and the courses through which it traveled to other parts of the city, afford a strong evidence that it was at first propagated chiefly by exhalation from putrid coffee. It is remarkable that it passed first through those alleys and streets which were in the course of the winds that blew across the dock and wharf where the coffee lay."³ It was also believed by some that the weather—the intense heat and the absence of heavy rains—had something to do with the appearance of the disease. Others called attention to the fact that "a great deal of dirt and filth and even real ordure" was found in the house of the first victims and to "the great numbers of people who, for some months past, had been too much thronged in the dwelling-houses."⁴ Of all the suggestions which were offered to account for the presence of yellow fever, Nicholas Collin, the last Swedish Lutheran pastor of Gloria Dei Church, made what has turned out to be the most pertinent observation: the fevers, he said, were usually most virulent in low and marshy places, especially where there was stagnant water.⁵ But no one at that time recognized that the mosquitoes which were breeding in such places were the real carriers of the disease.

While such speculations were being aired, the fever spread. It was believed to be contagious. "The contagion affects across a street, and perhaps much farther," Dr. Rush wrote to his wife who was summering in Princeton, New Jersey. "The most dreadful circumstance in this terrible disease," wrote Pastor Helmuth, "was that few, very few, who approached any person afflicted with it, could escape the infection." It seemed to be a miracle for anyone to be constantly exposed to it without becoming ill. "The disease spreads. Though all our citizens are not ill, yet no one now is well, for they all breathe an air nearly alike charged with the contagion. A giddiness in the head, sickness at stomach once or twice a day, pain in the back or sides

3 B. Rush, *An Account of the Bilious Remitting Yellow Fever, as it Appeared in the City of Philadelphia in the Year 1793* (Philadelphia: 1794), 153-155; A. Biddle, ed., *Old Family Letters Relating to the Yellow Fever*, Series B (Philadelphia: 1892), 3; H. Helmuth, *A Short Account of the Yellow Fever in Philadelphia, for the Reflecting Christian* (Philadelphia: 1794), 8-9.

4 Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 7-8.

5 Amandus Johnson, *The Journal and Biography of Nicholas Collin, 1746-1831* (Philadelphia: 1936), 188-189.

are almost universal complaints in people who walk the streets and follow their usual work." Such indisposition could be a symptom of approaching fever, for, as Dr. Rush pointed out, "Sometimes it comes on with a chilly fit and a high fever, but more frequently it steals on with headache, languor, and sick stomach. These symptoms are followed by stupor, delirium, vomiting, a dry skin, cool or cold hands and feet, a feeble slow pulse, sometimes below in frequency the pulse of health. The eyes are at first suffused with blood, they afterwards become yellow, and in most cases a yellowness covers the whole skin on the third or fourth day. Few survive the fifth day, but more die on the second and third days. In some cases the patients possess their reason to the last, and discover much less weakness than in the last stage of common fevers. One of my patients stood up and shaved himself on the morning of the day he died. Livid spots on the body, a bleeding at the nose, from the gums, and from the bowels, and a vomiting of black matter in some instances close the scenes of life."⁶

The disease struck suddenly and violently. The mortality was unusually high. Helmuth recorded in his Diary that he had buried four persons from one house in a single week. Later on he described a visit to the daughter of one of his parishioners where "the father, the brother's wife, the brother, and the brother's child have died, and finally also the mother, all within two weeks; and she was all alone in the midst of this woe." During the second week of October, when 700 were buried in Philadelphia, the epidemic took its heaviest toll in lives. All together 4,044 deaths were recorded while the epidemic was running its course, from August 1 to November 9.⁷ Since the population of Philadelphia was at this time between 40,000 and 45,000, the mortality reached almost ten percent.

As the epidemic spread it brought with it a veritable panic of fear. "The terror on account of this dangerous disease is universal," Helmuth wrote in his Diary. "In the street all kinds of woe—the sick and those who were lamenting sick relatives. The despair extraordinary." "So great is the apprehension of death from the disorder," Dr. Rush communicated to his wife, "that I have seldom visited a patient the first time without being met at the head of the stairs by some member of the family in tears. Good Mrs. Meare took me by the hand the first time I visited her son and was dumb for some time with fear and distress. Another lady whom you do not know fell upon my neck and wept aloud for several minutes before she would let me enter her husband's room." "More tears have been shed in my entry and in my back parlor within the last month than have been shed perhaps

6 Biddle, *op. cit.*, 9-10, 26, 41; Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 5-6.

7 Rush, *op. cit.*, 128-130. "Several of the deaths in August were from other acute disorders, and a few in the succeeding months were from such as were of a chronic nature." Cf. Helmuth, *A Short Account*, ii.

for years before in our city. Never can I forget the awful sight of mothers wringing their hands, fathers dumb for a while with fear and apprehension, and children weeping aloud before me and calling me to hasten to the relief of their sick relations."⁸ Pastor Helmuth also made a note of "the groans and lamentations of some of the dying, which sometimes became so loud as to be heard distinctly in several adjoining houses and in the street."

The terror of the people found expression, first of all, in curious measures to ward off infection. "The smoke of tobacco being regarded as preventative, many persons, even women and small boys, had segars constantly in their mouths. Others placing full confidence in garlic, chewed it almost the whole day; some kept it in their shoes. . . . Some houses were hardly a moment in the day free from the smell of gunpowder, burned tobacco, nitre, sprinkled vinegar, &c. . . . Many were almost incessantly purifying, scouring, and whitewashing their rooms. Those who ventured abroad had handkerchiefs or sponges impregnated with vinegar or camphor at their noses, or else smelling salts with the thieves' vinegar. Others carried pieces of tarred rope in their hands or pockets, or camphor bags tied around their necks. . . . A person with a crepe or any appearance of mourning was shunned like a viper."⁹ Similar precautions were taken even in some distant cities where postmasters set aside letters which came from Philadelphia, lifted them with a pair of tongs, and dipped them in vinegar before handling them.¹⁰

Another expression of the popular terror may be seen in the large exodus from the city. Dr. Dunlapp told Helmuth that "he fears that hardly anyone will survive this fever; the safest thing is flight." Dr. Rush also declared that "there is only one preventive of it that is certain, and that is to fly from it."¹¹ When even the physicians despaired, it cannot be surprising that those who were able to do so speedily left the city. "Thousands of the inhabitants fled away," Helmuth reports. "Nearly one third left the city. . . . The streets of the city looked quite empty; most of the stores and a great many houses were shut up; many of those who remained in the city kept themselves pent up in the back part of their houses, and even cut off all communication with the neighborhood. Night appeared to me, at least sometimes, most melancholy. Such a deep silence reigned in the streets between nine and ten o'clock at night as at other times was scarcely to be found at twelve or one in the

8 [Anonymous,] *An Account of the Rise, Progress, and Termination of the Malignant Fever Lately Prevalent in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: 1793), 13, 17, 19; Biddle, *op. cit.*, 31; Helmuth, *op. cit.*, 40; cf. Nathan G. Goodman, *Benjamin Rush, Physician and Citizen* (Philadelphia: 1934), 184.

9 Goodman, *op. cit.*, 183; cf. Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 3-4, 40.

10 Matthew Carey, *Short Account of the Malignant Fever Lately Prevalent in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: 1794), 93.

11 Biddle, *op. cit.*, 10.

morning. I perfectly recollect several visits of the sick which I had to make, entirely alone, at that time of the night, and that at a considerable distance from my dwelling. Houses shut up to the right and the left, deserted by their inhabitants, or containing persons struggling in death at that very time, or whose former inhabitants were all dead already, formed a part of the melancholy scene. In two or three squares hardly a living soul was to be met with where twenty or thirty persons would else be passing and repassing at that time of night."¹²

An effect of the mass exodus from the city and a further evidence of the universal fear was the cessation of normal activities in Philadelphia. Three of the four city newspapers suspended publication. Mails were not delivered. Schools remained closed. Many churches discontinued public services. Bells were kept from tolling. Coffee houses were shut up for want of patrons. Artisans of all kinds were thrown out of work when trade and industry came to a virtual standstill. Only the most necessary business was carried on. Meanwhile, the cost of provisions rose sharply. Nurses demanded, and received, as much as four dollars a day. The combination of unemployment and rising prices brought want and poverty in its wake, but "not a single overseer of the poor" remained in the city to help the destitute. Gifts totaling \$2,130.83, which were sent to Helmuth by Lutheran churches in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, were distributed to widows and orphans through a committee;¹³ these contributions, however, were too small to meet the distressing needs even in one congregation.

But it was the condition of those who were fever-ridden which was most pathetic. The fear of contagion was so great that they were often abandoned to their fate. Few ventured near them. "Even his mother," Helmuth observed when he visited a sick young man, "sits in the remotest part of the house, full of fright and terror." After another visit Helmuth wrote in his Diary: "My God, what distress! The woman dying in an exceedingly small room; the man wretched with the very same disease; no one to attend them except a very small boy. No neighbor approaches the house. Went home with a heavy heart." Collin, the Swedish pastor, made similar observations: "Husbands, married perhaps for twenty years, deserted their wives in the agonies of the death bed (yea, they would sometimes leave them in the very moment of childbirth), wives unfeelingly abandoned their husbands, parents forsaking their own children; children ungratefully flying from their parents and resigning them to chance, often without an inquiry after their

¹² Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 31; cf. Rush, *op. cit.*, 124-125.

¹³ *Liste von freiwilligen Contribuenten für die Armen der Evangelisch Lutherischen Gemeinde in Philadelphia bei der jetzt grassirenden Seuche*, a manuscript in the archives of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania (PH 48, 27). Cf. Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 54.

health or safety, masters hurrying off their faithful servants to Bush Hill,¹⁴ even on suspicion of fever, and that at a time when, like Tartarus, it was open to every visitant but never returned any; servants abandoning tender and humane masters, who only wanted a little care to restore their health; many men of affluent fortunes who had given daily employment and sustenance to hundreds abandoned to the care of a negro, after their wives, children, friends, clerks, and servants had left them to their fate; many of the poor perishing without a human being to hand them a drink of water."¹⁵ The testimony of these pastors was further confirmed by Dr. Rush. "Many," he wrote, "die without nurses. Some perish from the want of a draught of water. . . . Many people thrust their parents into the streets as soon as they complain of a headache."¹⁶ Although such neglect of the sick was quite general, there were also instances, as Helmuth pointed out, of persons "whom the Lord had inspired with fortitude in such a manner that they went without fear to the forsaken and by their attention saved their lives."¹⁷

The distress of the sick was further increased by the shortage of physicians. "It was in the most dreadful stage of the sickness that some of the most famous among them died, others from terror had fled out of the city, and others again were dangerously ill." Probably half of the people who were struck down by the fever could not secure medical advice and help. "At one time there were only three physicians who were able to do business out of their houses, and at this time there were probably not less than 6,000 persons ill with the fever."¹⁸ Dr. Rush alone often attended from 100 to 150 patients a day. "I had forty or fifty new calls yesterday and the day before," he wrote in the middle of September. Two days later he wrote: "For several days past I have sent 50 to 60 patients to other doctors." A week after that he recorded that he was "forced to decline thirty-eight fresh applicants."¹⁹ Impossible as it was for the few physicians to give personal attention to all the sick, Dr. Rush turned to the public press to reach those who received no medical care. On September 13 he had an article published in the *American Daily Advertiser* in which he offered directions for the prevention and cure of the fever. "Mr. Helmuth called upon me," he wrote shortly afterward, "and told me . . . that he had found, in visiting his congregation, many people cured by following my printed directions without the advice of a physician."²⁰

14 Bush Hill "was taken and converted into a hospital for the poor and such as had not conveniences of being nursed in their own homes": Anon., *Account*, 19-20.

15 Johnson, *op. cit.*, 178.

16 Biddle, *op. cit.*, 32.

17 Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 27.

18 *Ibid.*, 28; Rush, *op. cit.*, 123. Ten physicians were reported to have died during the epidemic: Carey, *op. cit.*, 72.

19 Biddle, *op. cit.*, 23, 31; Rush, *op. cit.*, 346.

20 Biddle, *op. cit.*, 32; Goodman, *op. cit.*, 177.

Helmuth also co-operated with the physicians by giving his parishioners public instruction; after his sermons, in which he tried to fortify the people spiritually, he "gave directions as to the external means, too, with which to take care of oneself intelligently in order that the evil might not spread further."

But what about the activities of the Lutheran pastors and their relations with their parishioners during these trying months? At the time there were two Lutheran congregations in Philadelphia. The first was Gloria Dei, the old Swedish church near the Delaware River of which Nicholas Collin was pastor. The second was St. Michael's and Zion, a German parish which had two church buildings at its disposal and which was served by J. Henry C. Helmuth and his associate J. Frederick Schmidt. During the yellow fever epidemic, when many other clergymen were disabled or left the city to avoid infection,²¹ the three Lutheran pastors remained faithfully at their posts. Members of Dr. Schmidt's household were smitten by the disease, and he was himself ill much of the time, so that Dr. Helmuth bore the heaviest burden of ministering to the German Lutherans. A physician told him that his congregation "ought to compel me to leave the city," but he stayed. Collin also remained through it all and was faithful in his ministry to the Swedish Lutherans.²² Unfortunately there is no detailed record of Collin's ministry during this period and we are consequently limited very largely to Helmuth's personal records.

Upon arising every morning at six o'clock, Helmuth used Bogatzky's *Schatz-Kästlein* as a guide for his morning devotions. The afflicted in his congregation occupied a prominent place in his prayers, not only in the morning, but again and again in the course of the day. "Awake early," one entry in his Diary reads. "Lifted my heart as well as I could to my Saviour. Got up at six o'clock, prayed again, and committed myself and the congregation, especially the many who are sick, to the Lord." Before a funeral he had a few moments for meditation. "In solitude I had composed my heart through Jesus. I had a precious little time with Him. Brought my sins, my congregation, the poor flock. . . ." On still another occasion he made a note of the fact that he had "prayed in hearty and childlike manner for myself and especially for the poor sick."

Helmuth was deeply concerned about the health of his own family. Although he generally did not allow the possibility of their becoming infected through him to keep him from the homes of the sick, he took every reasonable precaution. He secured a "mixture" from a physician which was supposed to protect him and his household against the fever. Whenever he or mem-

21 Seven clergymen were sick during the epidemic and eleven others died according to Carey, *op. cit.*, 73. Helmuth charged, in his Diary, that others fled. Cf. Anon., *Account*, 23.

22 Johnson, *op. cit.*, 179.

ers of his family showed signs of indisposition, he administered "bark and brandy." After visiting the sick he always changed his clothing completely and fumigated those which he had worn in order to avoid carrying the contagion into his home. But the dangers were never absent from his thoughts. They harassed him even in his dreams. So he dreamed one night that he was walking "with Pastor Kuhn, he in front of me, along the edge of a small stream of clear water which was very swollen and seemed to rise higher than my path. The path was flooded with water. Kuhn plunged through it. I followed him calmly and unconcernedly and did not seem to get wet. Awake in the middle of the dream. Dreamed again. There was water on every side. I should have turned to the left, but failed to do this. The water rose behind me and in front of me. I saw no sure way of escape. Then I awoke again. My dreams seldom show me the way out. My guardian spirit, if there is such a thing, either does not himself know the way out, or else he thinks that it is better to show me only a part of the danger in order to make me careful and alert."

It appears that Helmuth's wife was more frightened than he was. She became anxious when so many people called at the parsonage to report new cases of illness or to arrange for funerals. She feared that they might bring the "contagion" with them. In fact, Helmuth himself became an object of fear in his own household: "I was feared," he wrote, "because I go about among the sick." There were times when this attitude on the part of his wife kept him home, as it did, for instance, when he was called to the home of a sick parishioner, "but did not go because my family is fearful of infection." On another occasion he refused to be deterred, and he was glad that he did not postpone his visit, for if he had, he would not have seen the patient alive. There were times, however, when utter weariness compelled him to forego visiting for a few hours. So we come upon an entry in his Diary which reads: "I probably should have gone to several sick people, but I did not do it because I believed that I needed some rest." Another reads: "After nine o'clock was desired to go to Pewter Platter Alley; but did not go because I was tired and moreover would have had to change all my clothes and then change them again afterward. Promised to go tomorrow if God is willing. Later this troubled me greatly that I had not gone. Lord Jesus, have mercy!" On still another occasion he hesitated to enter the home of a sick man to which he had been summoned because, on approaching it, he detected a "strong death odor." "I regarded this as a hint not to subject myself willfully to this danger, because I had heard that these poor people did not take the slightest precaution to cleanse the stuffy air—windows and doors closed; no fumigation; no sprinkling of vinegar. God, forgive me for Jesus' sake if I have been too sensitive or too unbelieving; but also when I am too bold. May it not harm the poor worm that he has not had a part in my ministry!"

Such occasional failures to respond at once to the calls of the sick weighed upon Helmuth's conscience. They made him restless throughout the rest of the day, they troubled his sleep at night, and then they became the subject of fervent prayers the next morning. "I, poor, heavily laden sinner," he prayed one morning, "pray for forgiveness for my grave sins, especially, Lord Jesus, the sins connected with my office. What have the poor sheep and lambs done? The shepherds, the shepherds are at fault if the neglected flock dies off. God, have mercy upon me. Forgiveness, forgiveness, true forgiveness of sins, dear Lord, grant unto me." On another morning he "brought before the Lord" all his sins, among the "most horrible" of which he counted "my prayer, preaching, sick visiting, conduct of funerals—sins, sins! Lord Jesus, forgive them for Thy death's sake." On still another morning when he confessed that he felt "very barren," he wrote in his Diary: "The sins of my office rested heavily upon my conscience. On their account I pleaded before the Lord with an oppressed heart." As a rule, after he had wept and prayed thus on his knees "as a very poor sinner," he could say, "My heart was quiet again and satisfied."

When the number of the sick continued to increase, it became necessary for Helmuth to regulate his work more carefully. He announced at the services of the church early in October "that notice of the sick should be given me in the morning in order that I might visit them in the afternoon—that it would grieve me if anyone were buried without my having seen him on his deathbed." Thereafter a list of all the new cases of sickness which had been reported was prepared every morning. The older patients were usually visited in the morning and the new patients in the afternoon. Helmuth traveled to the sick in the remotest parts of Philadelphia. He ministered not only to Lutherans, but also to Reformed, Methodist, Mennonite, and Catholic people whose pastors had either fled from the city or succumbed to the common malady. The church council provided him with a chaise, a horse, and a man to drive it "in order that I might be able to get around more easily among the sick."

Upon entering the homes of the sick Helmuth came face to face with unspeakable misery, tragedy, and fear. Those who were not sick were overwhelmed with grief and terror. The sick, who were kept at a distance for fear of contagion, were often racked with pain. They were usually horrible to look upon. Helmuth described one woman who had "coal black eyes and a green nose, like a person who has been in a violent fist fight." He also recorded the case of a man who turned black while he was praying with him. His ministry was adapted to the spiritual and physical condition of each patient. It was his custom, however, to use some thoughts from his morning devotions, or from a recently delivered sermon, or from his casual meditations when he addressed the sick. For example, he once made note

of the fact that "the following evangelical thoughts consoled several of my sick people today and induced in some of them a blessed flow of tears: When I go to the market to buy something, that for which I laid down my money and paid is mine, and the money which I laid down belongs to the seller. Application: Jesus paid, not gold or silver, but His blood for my sins. My sins now no longer belong to me, but to the Lord Jesus, and His blood and the righteousness which He earned no longer belong to the Lord Jesus, but to me. Consequently sin can no longer damn me, praise be to Jesus, but only unbelief that will not accept this exchange." It was in such simple terms that Helmuth tried to bring the consolation of the Gospel to those who were on the brink of eternity. He did not deem the tragic days of the epidemic "a proper time further to distress the poor, terrified creatures by the threats of judgment when they were distressed already beyond their power to bear."²³ When Helmuth administered the Sacrament to the sick, he sometimes communed with the patient and others of the household, except, strangely enough, when he was "afraid to receive it" because his "faith was very weak." His curious attitude toward the Sacrament is also reflected in the fact that he seldom administered it to the sick and even discouraged many who asked for it.

The response to his ministrations Helmuth found encouraging. Some, who had before been indifferent to the church and the Gospel, remained so to their end. But the frightful effects of the epidemic had made most men think more seriously about God and eternity. As a consequence most of those whom he visited were grateful for his ministrations. "If I had never before been convinced of the advantages which a Christian has over the infidel," he wrote, "the instances which I have seen of the dying condition of both would have been more than sufficient to produce such a conviction in my mind."²⁴ Anecdotes of the sick who faced their sufferings, and many of them their death, with steadfast faith were diligently recorded by Helmuth. Here is a typical one: "Nearly at the beginning of the disorder I was called to a young man who was dying. He was very low. But my visit seemed to give him a great deal of pleasure. He answered the questions respecting the state of his mind with the greatest alacrity and with the full conviction that he knew in whom he believed. So sweet a smile diffused itself over the already livid features of his face, as often as the merits of his crucified Lord were mentioned, that it might have been taken rather for the smile of an angel than that of a sinful mortal. He found an unfailing life in the death of Jesus."

Up to the limit of his time and strength Helmuth was as conscientious in burying the dead as he was in preparing the sick for death. The character

²³ Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 35.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 17. Cf. Rush, *op. cit.*, 126-128.

of the funerals was of course affected by the circumstances. In the first place, the dead were disposed of with the greatest haste. Those who died in the morning were often buried before noon because "the neighbors did not wish to keep the corpse until afternoon." "Many of the dearest relations were hurried out of the house as quickly as possible, perhaps even before they were cold. Coffins and graves were bespoken beforehand for some. Everyone wanted to be the first to have his dead buried out of his sight, for immediately after the death of a sick person, the body would turn to putrefaction and would increase the cadaverous smell considerably, which had been spread through the house and neighborhood during the sickness. The whole neighborhood generally insisted very earnestly upon it that the danger should be removed as quickly as possible. Very few had the courage to approach a house where any dead lay, much less to enter it."²⁵ In the second place, funerals were unusual in that they were almost unattended. For fear of contagion "the number of attendants at a funeral was greatly diminished. Everybody retired at the approach of a hearse. Windows and doors were shut as they passed. Frequently nobody but the driver of the hearse or chair shafts and the inviter accompanied a coffin which hundreds would have followed at other times." Dr. Rush wrote to his wife that "it is indeed truly affecting to see a solitary corpse, on the shafts and wheels of a chair, conducted through our streets without a single attendant in some cases, and with only eight or ten in any instance, and they at a small distance from it on the foot pavement."²⁶ In the third place, funerals during the epidemic were held at every hour of the day or night. Some of them were held before dawn. On one such occasion, when Helmuth was awakened at five o'clock in the morning, a profound disinclination apparently fathered the excuses he offered for not going: "Because I had nothing that I could entrust to my empty stomach, I became afraid that perhaps I might take too much risk in going to this funeral. . . . Moreover, I was in a sweat and my teeth were also troubling me." Helmuth was often "among the graves until after sun-down," and sometimes far into the night when lanterns had to be used. "The day frequently would not suffice to bury all the dead because no assistance was to be had in digging graves, and it was impossible for our usual grave diggers to make from twenty to twenty-six graves in a day; it therefore became necessary in several instances to take the night to it. Melancholy for all and dreadful for many as these scenes were in the streets of the city, yet (to the praise of my gracious Redeemer I record it) this nightly silence among the tombs, when I was waiting for funerals and wandering, quite alone, among the newly raised hills, was sometimes sweetly

25 Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 34.

26 *Ibid.*, 29; Biddle, *op. cit.*, 11-12; cf. Anon., *Account*, 17.

solemn."²⁷ Occasionally Helmuth left the cemetery before all were buried because he had important visits to make, or because he was cold, or, as he confided to his Diary in two instances, "because I had an urgent diarrhea and could hardly reach home."

The extent of Helmuth's work, not only in visiting the sick, but also in burying the dead, can be estimated from the fact that 641 members of his congregation were buried in a little over three months. Seventy-five members of the Swedish Lutheran church were buried in the same period. In other words, almost one out of every five who died in the city was a Lutheran, and one out of every six was a member of Dr. Helmuth's congregation. This tremendous mortality can be accounted for by the fact that the German Lutheran congregation had the largest membership in the city; by the fact that the fever took its heaviest toll among the poor, who made up the greater part of the German congregation; and by the fact that poverty prevented most of the Lutherans from leaving the city and thus escaping the disease.²⁸

But besides visiting the sick and burying the dead, Helmuth found time to conduct two services every Sunday, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Evening prayer meetings were discontinued during the epidemic, "as we thought that they might be hurtful on account of the evening air." But their place was taken by meetings which were held at eight o'clock every morning. Precautions were taken at all these services in the church. The windows were opened "long before the time of meeting in order that the fresh morning air might pervade it; afterwards all the doors and windows were shut and a strong smoke of juniper berries and nitre was made throughout the whole house. Then the people gathered. When all were met, many, or few, or perhaps all of the windows and doors were opened according as the weather required."²⁹ Except for inclement weather, the services were well attended. What Helmuth wrote in his Diary after one service may perhaps hold for most of them: "the church full, the congregation attentive, the address mediocre." Helmuth, who did most of the preaching since his colleague, Dr. Schmidt, was in bed or ailing during the greater part of the epidemic, was a ready speaker. The pressure of his many other duties made him rely on his facility of speech, and he often spoke without preparation, "nach Wunsch des Herzens." "Here," he said, "prevailed not the stiffness of an accurately arranged and methodically divided sermon; here the friend, the lover, the father was speaking to his children the sentiments of an upright heart. Never during the time of our office was preaching a more welcome and blessed duty than what we found it during this calamity, and

27 Helmuth, *A Short Account*, 29-30.

28 *Ibid.*, 47-50. Helmuth also intimates that the clergymen of other churches did not keep such accurate records as he did.

29 *Ibid.*, 44-45.

never, we sincerely believe, were we so useful in the vineyard of the Lord as in those days."³⁰ As a rule Helmuth recorded the effect of his preaching in his Diary. Such entries as "the assembly was very attentive" and "abundant tears flowed here and there" are not infrequent.

Both in his sermons and elsewhere Helmuth repeatedly expressed his conviction that the epidemic of yellow fever was a visitation of God, "a deserved punishment of a just as well as merciful God." "This is the truth which I preached," he recorded in his Diary: "The common means of grace are not adequate to soften the hard heart; hence the Lord has recourse to the evils which He has threatened in His Word as punishments, and these evils will continue until all those have turned to Him who still wish to have their souls saved. Arise, therefore, o souls, for your sake, for the sake of those who are yours, for the sake of the city! Arise, mend your ways and step into the breach!" The sins of Philadelphians to which he made specific reference were luxury, dissipation, theatre-going, rope-dancing, circus attendance, Sabbath-breaking, the frequenting of taverns, cursing, swearing, perjury, the defrauding of widows and orphans, drunkenness, lewdness, pride, avarice, uncharitableness, and quarreling.³¹

By the end of October the epidemic had spent itself. "The citizens are crowding into town every day," Dr. Rush wrote to his wife when he noticed that those who had previously fled were beginning to return to Philadelphia. Helmuth feared that they were returning too soon, although "the sickness has certainly fallen off." With the advent of colder weather early in December the city resumed its normal appearance. The Lutheran parochial school was re-opened and the congregations quickly restored their full program of activities. But it took months, even years, before the survivors of the appalling tragedy could free themselves from the grip of terror.

Meanwhile the faithful ministry of Helmuth became a legend. Among all the clergymen in Philadelphia, according to one observer, "the truly Reverend Henry Helmuth (pastor of the Lutheran congregation in this city) claims particular applause. This worthy clergyman, not satisfied to wait for the call of his people, invited them from the pulpit universally to make free to send for him at all times by day or night. Indeed, he consecrated all his time, whilst the disease prevailed, to assist and comfort his flock: and the sick among them were so numerous that he had but little

30 *Ibid.*, 42-43. For estimates of Helmuth's preaching see Stoever, in *The Evangelical Review*, 6: 3-6, and Sprague, *op. cit.*, 52-53.

31 Helmuth's Diary records the texts and the topics of many of his sermons. In keeping with the character of his Pietism, most of Helmuth's texts were from the Old Testament. Cf. *A Short Account*, 10-21.

time he could call his own."³² Such praise troubled Helmuth. He feared the approval of men. In the solitude of his study he lifted his heart to God in characteristic fashion: "The Hosanna is usually followed by a Crucifige. Alas, o God! And then I would not like to have my part in this world. Only give me the consolation of Thy Spirit, and take everything else from me; then I will be satisfied."

32 Anon., *Account*, 23; cf. Demme, *op. cit.*, 17.

NOTES AND STUDIES

HOW SHOULD RELIGION BE DEFINED?

HAROLD L. CREAGER

Waterloo, Ontario

THE story of the spiritual pilgrimage of mankind is baffling as well as fascinating. And there are several reasons why it is difficult to formulate a satisfactory definition of religion: its wide scope, as extensive as life itself; the extreme diversity of the forms in which it has been manifested; the customary indiscriminating application of the word to several fairly distinct phases of the subject; the fact that it is practically an ultimate, an elemental rather than a secondary or resultant factor in human life; and the almost inescapable need of using in the definition other words which are similarly lacking in immediate precision of meaning. Moreover, religion is not just a bundle of characteristics; even though its various elements could be accurately analyzed and tabulated and correlated in a neat formula, the living soul of religion would almost inevitably be lost in the process, and the result—however scientific or artistic—would lack the vital spark that is an essential characteristic of religion.

Is it possible, then, to find a common quality in such widely different expressions of the religious desires and impulses as are found in the primitive animism, the numerous polytheisms, the various monotheistic faiths, and miscellaneous other systems—to identify and express an inner factor that marks the essence of religion? Can a definition in general be formulated which will have real meaning—i.e., which will not be a reducing of the various religions and the whole spirit of religion to such thin remnants of superficial and subsidiary factors or such pale abstractions that all genuine significance and vitality is lost?

It must be noted that some people repudiate the very effort to define "religion." It has even become the fashion in some quarters to decry the use of the word. The reason for this is perfectly easy to understand; for many times people have spoken of various religions as though they were all pretty much alike and of practically equal value. And in order to emphasize and safeguard the uniqueness, the absoluteness, and the supremacy of Christianity, some have considered it desirable to refrain from applying a common term to it and to other systems of faith. Either Christianity is

the only religion and others are not truly to be called religions at all, they say, or else others are "religions" and Christianity belongs in an entirely different category; and either way, the common use of the term religion is obviously improper. Now the danger of considering Christianity just another religion (with perhaps some points of superiority and some of inferiority), against which this protest is directed, is real and serious enough. But it is doubtful whether that is the way to meet it. It involves too great a revolution in the established use of language. Probably the effort never could succeed—and never should. It is neither necessary nor desirable. The unique distinction of Christianity can be safeguarded otherwise, and the broad inclusive idea of religion is too valuable to sacrifice.

Before attempting to make a definition, a survey of the uses of the word is necessary. First, three different aspects from which religion has often been viewed must be clearly recognized. Sometimes it is conceived primarily as a *quest*—a search for explanations to the mysteries and perplexities of existence, a seeking for comfort and sustaining strength amid the sorrows and failures and menaces that crowd life, a groping for real meaning and satisfying values in life, a longing for greater joys beyond this life. And sometimes it is represented as a set of answers to man's questions—a body of *beliefs* about the world, life, God, morals, the hereafter, etc. And sometimes it is considered as a complex of *attitudes and actions* (whether in the realm of ritual or of moral conduct), based upon beliefs.

All three of these aspects have a valid place in the total picture of religion. It is a mistake to try to define it in any one of them to the neglect of the others. There are always quests, and there are always answers; even in the crudest times answers are offered, and widely accepted; and even in the most advanced stages of revelation, there still are continuing quests for clearer and fuller understanding of the answers given, and desires to go beyond them. And likewise the beliefs held always have some results in the attitudes adopted and the things done. Incidentally, it will be noted that intellectual, emotional, and volitional factors are all involved; religion has to do with the whole personality.

Then there is a second set of distinctions, cutting across the features just mentioned. Religion may be considered in the abstract, as a general spirit or quality in life, apart from any specific system of it. Or it may be thought of as it takes form in various concrete systems, and any particular religion considered. "A religion" would mean a certain set of beliefs and teachings, including a rather definite pattern of attitudes (such as fear, reverence, adoration, submission, loyal devotion, love, gratitude, trust, hope, joy), together with fairly well established ceremonies (of worship, etc.) and some regulating standards of conduct. Finally, religion may be considered as it is found in any one person; this would include individual

spiritual desires and quests, individual beliefs and ideas, individual feelings and attitudes and applications of the conceptions held.

One more preliminary consideration is necessary. Usually religion has been concerned with what may broadly be designated as "the supernatural"—whether God, or gods, or demons, or spirits. Is this essential? Perhaps the term supernatural may be stretched to accommodate such extremes as the ultra-primitive notion of a mysterious, wide-spread power ("Mana," etc.) and the ultra-sophisticated philosophy of an abstract Absolute or Ultimate—both of which serve as religious bases. A special problem is raised by early Buddhism, from which the supernatural in any ordinary sense is notably lacking. It is commonly admitted that it scarcely fits in with the usual definitions of religion, and those who hesitate to class it as a religion have some justification for their reluctance. Nevertheless, it has so many of the factors and qualities of religion that it can scarcely be excluded from the classification. It was not mere humanistic ethics and philosophy. It stressed a fundamental and practically universal law of causality; and it was directed toward an ideal goal—the transcending of the problems and distresses of life. Thus it, too, was based on something above the ordinary human realm, and was projected beyond that realm.

On the other hand, there is a modern tendency to apply the term religion to various movements which professedly and actually lie entirely within the human realm. Thus we have been treated to so-called religions of Humanity, and of Ethical Culture; and we have seen the fanatical devotion to Communism or Fascism gravely referred to as religion. But this seems to be taking unwarranted liberties with the word. Such widening of its significance involves almost as much of a revolution in the use of language as does the narrowing of its meaning referred to above. It does not seem possible or proper to designate a political philosophy, or an ethical theory, or a social ideal as a religion—even though it may inspire somewhat the same sort of personal attitudes of devotion as religion does and may enlist the same sort of enthusiasm and unselfish service. Rather does it seem proper to apply the term religion only when there is a definite and prominent place given to something which is beyond human and physical nature. For the sake of brevity, the term "the supernatural" is used below as an inclusive designation for whatever center of interest and value exists or may be conceived beyond man and the material world—God, spirit, Power, Absolute, ideal goal, etc.

There may seem to be some degree of arbitrariness in thus delimiting the application of the word religion. Arguments may be offered against it, and attempts made to justify the wider and looser use of the word. However, it is not really a matter of argument but of definition. In a wide field of more or less related phenomena in human life and experience and activity,

a certain group is by common consent designated as religion; adjacent portions partake in part of the same characteristics, so that some at least are to be included therewith; and others definitely lie outside. Drawing a line of demarcation is neither whim nor dogmatism. The basic etymological meaning of the word, or the actual usage developed from that inherent significance, must determine the extent of its application. Now one of the major factors in religion, an essential and distinguishing characteristic, is the emphasis on the supernatural. In a purely formal and preliminary way, therefore, religion might be defined as those attitudes and activities of human beings which are concerned with the supernatural, and are in subordination thereto (this special limitation is needed in order to distinguish it from magic, in which man seeks to control supernatural powers for his own ends and to coerce them to do his will; this matter is taken for granted through the rest of this discussion).

Such a formal definition is far from satisfying. What is more to be desired is a descriptive definition, which will indicate the actual content that is included in the word. First of all, then, religion in the abstract may be defined as the belief in the reality, importance, and value of the supernatural, the yearning to understand it and get its benefits, the practicing of methods of relationship with it, and the applying of its controlling influence to life.

Concretely, a religion is a system of teachings about the nature of the supernatural, the connections thereof with the world and man, and the demands imposed thereby, together with three things which result from this—a set of normal attitudes (toward the supernatural, physical nature, and personal life), methods for effecting right relations with the supernatural or approaching the ideal, and a body of regulations upon conduct. It is evident, then, that the character of a religion depends primarily upon the conception of the supernatural. Thus if this is conceived as personal or impersonal, unitary or manifold, moral or immoral or amoral, immanent or transcendent, friendly or antagonistic, lenient or stern, omnipotent or limited, actually existent or merely conceptual, great contrasts result. Such things make the fundamental differences in religions. And to this matter of the nature and character attributed to the supernatural must be added the degree of vividness and vitality with which the conception is infused; a conception may be flabby and sterile (however pure or good it may be in itself), or so invested with power as to be compelling and fruitful.

Religion in its personal aspect is "a religion" functioning in an individual life, with whatever modifications it receives at the hands of the individual. The connection between the personal aspect of religion and the impersonal, concrete system is very close. Sir James Frazer says of primitive religion that it was the "pattern after which every man strove to shape his life."

This statement still has significance (if "every" is omitted), and suggests the transition to the individual aspect. From this angle religion may be defined as the effort to know and understand and have good relations with the supernatural, the accepting of certain ideas about it, the yielding of certain emotional responses to it and because of it, and the organizing and controlling of life according to the knowledge or belief acquired about it and from it. It will be evident here that the character of the religion depends not only on the content of the conceptions but also on the degree of importance (in itself and in its importance for life) with which the supernatural is actually invested for the individual, and on the extent to which it is brought into practical application in the life.

Summarizing these elements, religion is the combination of: the conception held of the supernatural and of the moral and ritual requirements made thereby; the accompanying attitudes of belief and desire, and resultant feelings; the cultivation of congruous and beneficial relations with the supernatural; and the regulating of life according to the values, standards, ideals, and goals implicit in or associated with the basic ideas. There may be some value in a more succinct statement, which will emphasize a dominant viewpoint and also serve as a focus around which the details may be organized and in which they find coherence and significance—even though no compact formula can be expected to present, comprehensively and explicitly, the full scope of such a large and complex matter. Accordingly, frankly disregarding the non-theistic forms as being of less importance, religion may be defined as the attempt to live in accordance with the idea of God.

Such a definition is broad enough to have room for such specialized ideas, e.g. as revelation and justification by faith. For if the supernatural is conceived as One who reveals Himself, that revelation will be accepted as regulative of the entire gamut of religious conceptions. And if there is a conception of One who forgives sin and receives into friendship on the basis of certain spiritual attitudes and relations, that will establish both the doctrine and the actual process of coming into divine favor. On the other hand, if the supernatural is conceived as having such a nature as to be appeased by human sacrifice, or cajoled by flattery, or coerced by sympathetic magic, then those methods will be employed. Again, if the supernatural is conceived as being concerned about human relations and ethical standards, this will set the norm for the whole moral tone of life and establish the ideal for the structure of society. And if the supernatural is considered receptive to appeals, petition will be practiced. In short, the definition is thoroughly elastic, and applicable to all sorts of religious and moral practices, depending on the conception held of the supernatural.

It may not be superfluous to call attention to the basic similarity of the viewpoint here presented to a challenging and haunting statement that came

out of the turmoil of the First World War. If memory serves rightly, it was Donald Hankey, in a book called *A Student in Arms*, who said that religion is "betting your whole life there is a God." That is to say, religion is living "as if." This includes a quest element; at least a tentative belief in something which is undemonstrable; and the acceptance of the guidance afforded by the hypothesis—what is called in more orthodox terminology "the adventure of faith." And it means holding fast to ideals in spite of the disillusionments and seeming futilities that abound in life, in the hope that everything is not a mockery and delusion but that there is a guarantee of real values, there is something to live for; and steadfastly refusing the allurements that would seduce one into living only for the present and the superficial thrills it offers, rejecting the attractions of the temporary and trivial because of the probability that there is something abiding and truly worthwhile and that it is available, turning down the apparent rewards of a life lived as if there were no God for the less tangible expectations bound up with the belief in God. Although this pregnant phrase can scarcely be called a definition of religion, it is a striking presentation of the essential idea that religion makes the conception of God controlling in life.

Finally, in its perfection, religion would be living according to the truth of God.

GOSPEL PREACHING IN THE CHRISTIAN YEAR

BENJAMIN LOTZ

Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

WHENEVER a preacher of the Christian Gospel sits in his study and prepares his sermon, his whole approach to this task is quite different if his personal tastes as well as the traditions of his church move within the ordered sequence of the Christian Year. For while the Christian Year is important for the Christian believer, the preacher of the Gospel can hardly ignore it or escape it. It guarantees measured rhythm to his preaching. For this reason, he ought to lay great importance on a continuous study of the Christian Year, not as a devotional aid—though it is that in a supreme sense—but as the matrix to mould his preaching. For the Christian Year with its recurring emphasis on the important things of the Gospel faith imposes upon the preacher, just as much as does the dogmatic faith of the church, the duty of the systematized preaching of the Gospel.

Lest this matter of the Gospel preaching within the framework of the Christian Year be a discussion which is nothing more than a fruitless dilettantism, we ought to be very clear about one or two things at the very

outset. In fact, these things are the basis for our whole study. For the rhythmical re-occurrence, year after year, of feast and fast presupposes a Christian experience so necessary that we must use every adjective at our command to intensify it. It is a *primal, elemental, fundamental, existential Christian experience*.

Moreover, every word which we use to describe this experience ought to make it obvious that humanly speaking it is an indispensable experience for every man who would preach the Gospel. Without this experience, the preacher is striking out into very thin air. In fact, to lack this experience disqualifies him before he starts and to disbelieve it makes him a liar before God and a cheat in the eyes of his congregation. If after mature study, a clergyman in any evangelical communion comes to the conclusion that this experience which is central in the Gospel is not central in his own life, then he ought to stop preaching at once.

Saint Paul said, "I believe and therefore have I spoken."¹ The Gospel revealed to him by God in the person of Jesus Christ was an experience central in his life. For that reason we can say that his life was henceforth Christo-centric. This fact then became the key to his life and anyone who can not understand the experience of his life can not really understand the Apostle. He ought not even try to read his letters. They are books closed and sealed. We are reminded of the words of Rudolph Otto in his great book, *Das Heilige*. In a passage describing elemental religious experiences, experiences common to the creature facing the Creator, he says, "We seek reflection on an experience of religious excitation which is as one-sided as possible. Anyone who can not do that or in fact has never had such an experience is asked not to continue reading."² In a real sense we must share great experiences before we can truly understand them.

No one would deny, however, that this Christian experience has an intellectual content which can and must be formulated into rational concepts, though no one would assert that the Christian experience has thereby been exhaustively treated. On the other hand, we shall see that this intellectual content can become a mere parade of learning and not the Gospel of Jesus Christ. That danger has never been absent in the church. In fact, this seems to be one of the points of contention in Saint Paul's correspondence with the church at Corinth.

We see that this thing happens when we begin our study of the preaching of the Gospel within the framework of the Christian Year. This one instance will suffice. A man's preaching may give obvious evidence that he knows all, or almost all, there is to be known about the festival of Christmas.

¹ II Corinthians 4:13.

² *Das Heilige*, p. 8

He may know certain facts that run parallel in the pagan cults. He may know the origin and history of its use in the Christian church as well as the superstitions or old customs associated with its observance. The preacher may know that the yule log is a tradition of merry England as well as the legend of the fir tree in the family life of Martin Luther. He may know the varied and curious customs connected with the Christmas eve supper in Scandinavian lands. He may know, too, that in Italy one celebrates the Nativity of our Lord by going to holy mass and shooting fire-crackers. His sermon may be a lovely and moving picture of Christmas in many lands but at the same time if he does not show that the incarnate Christ has been born in his own heart, all that he says is for him, at least, and eventually for all of his hearers only sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.

The experience of the preacher of the Gospel is necessary for everyone who would preach the Gospel. While even a phonograph repeating the promises of the Gospel can sow the seeds of the Word in men's hearts, this automaton can not be compared to one who is marked and signed by Jesus Christ. Genuine preaching must not be mere intellectual display, or even just intellectual acumen, if it is to have its real result. Soren Kierkegaard is right: "And it is in truth something quite different to stand on one leg and to prove God's existence and to kneel down and thank Him."³

This quotation brings us face to face with the real issue. There is a rhythm to God's grace and mercy which is reflected in the Christian Year and which is the expression, in historical and devotional forms, of an inescapable Gospel experience not only for the believing Christian but of special importance for the Christian preacher. We may formulate that experience in a variety of ways. It may be the basis for extended theological treatises. It may be treated in the light of the most recent philosophical or psychological movements. It may be stated simply, with the consciousness, however, that an oversimplification is likely to create serious misconceptions.

In a paucity of words, fewer than which it is impossible to state it, our experience can be defined as follows: *I, the believing Christian, know that Christ died for me. I, the believing Christian, know that Christ lives in me.* This is the experience of the Gospel and woe to the preacher who has never experienced it!

Anyone knows, moreover, that the Christian preacher who is a sinner and at the same time more or less a saint can not be permanently satisfied

3 *Kierkegaard-Studien*, Erstes Heft, von Emanuel Hirsch, p. 69: "Und es ist in Wahrheit etwas ganz Verschiedenes, auf einem Beine stehen und Gottes Dasein beweisen, und auf seinen Knien ihm danken." A Lutheran pastor in the eastern part of the United States, except perhaps those who live in Brooklyn, must be pardoned for citing a German translation rather than the original of Kierkegaard's Journals. Only a wealthy man can afford to buy them and libraries do not have them.

with this simple statement of his experience. "Woe is unto me," Saint Paul wrote, "if I preach not the Gospel."⁴ In another place, he writes, "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified."⁵ In one sense, these are statements which are simply and easily understood. They tell of Saint Paul's Gospel and the urgent need he felt to proclaim it. On the other hand, ever since he wrote these words, theologians of one kind or another have been seeking out the doctrinal as well as the practical implications contained in them. This study means not only historical and philological research, but also the building of concepts, the systematized theological study of the relationship of these concepts one to another, for every concept is, as far as it is possible, an intellectual formulation of the content of our faith.

This means that every preacher of the Gospel has a theological task, the doing of which he can not escape. The basis of it is dogmatics or the attempts to formulate in rational concepts the experience that he has known through God's Spirit. Naturally this opens the door to other theological disciplines, to ethics, to apologetics, and to exegesis. These are necessary studies for the Christian preacher and *woe unto him* if he has not achieved at least a partial victory over them. Otherwise he will never understand the simple words of the Apostle, uttered with telling urgency, "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel."

The surer knowledge of the things of our faith will clarify the certainty of our faith and also strengthen the hope that is within us. There is something, however, which we need to know which goes beyond our theoretical thinking about our faith, however rigorous that thinking has been. For our knowledge will be incomplete and our best tools lacking if we do not have a firsthand acquaintance with the devotional and liturgical literature of the Christian church as it has been expressed in the great literary monuments of all times. This is one of the finest incentives to better preaching, not merely of preaching more excellent in form and in elegance of expression but also richer and more intensified in spirit. For in climbing God's great altar stairs of prayer and praise, we catch anew hymns of strength, sung in faith by saints and sinners in every age.

This acquaintance with the devotional literature dare not be limited as if the sound of every discordant doctrinal note would cause alarm. A Lutheran pastor ought to know how to venture forth into unknown harbors because he is unafraid. He, of all men, ought to know how to discriminate wisely and well. For that reason, his knowledge of Christian devotional literature ought to be most widespread and of the greatest diversity, a knowledge gathered from all Christian and non-Christian communions.

4 I Corinthians 9:16.

5 I Corinthians 2:2.

If this knowledge is to be of practical use, it must be fitted into a systematized scheme, that is, into the rhythm of the Christian Year. The makers of the Christian Year, assuming that there were such conscious artificers, knew the psychological value of this manner of studying and applying the Christian faith. None of us can live forever on the highest planes of spiritual existence. Saint Paul knew the heights of communion with God in prayer. Yet for him, as for every man, these mountain heights of prayer rise above the ordinary, everyday plain of common life. That, in a word, tells the psychological value of special days and seasons. They are inns of fellowship where we stop to put aside the burdens of life for a while, to deepen our faith, to secure clearer vision when hard and dark days come to take their heavy toll from the reserve of faith that God has given us.

Perhaps it might be just as well to say that there is a pedagogical value in this manner of viewing the fine art of preaching. There is a fullness and completeness to the Christian faith that necessarily prevents an oversimplification of it. There are nuances and implications that make it inexhaustible. There are major and minor doctrines. For that reason, every preacher must face the fact that however necessary it is for him to preach, not a partial but the whole Gospel, in one sense he can never present it in its totality in one or even in many sermons. Whether it offends his egotism or not, he faces a time limit that dare not be overlooked in the preparation of his sermon.

Edgar Allan Poe—who is a strange counselor for clerics—declares that there is no such thing as a long poem.⁶ His ideal poem is from 100 to 108 lines in length. If a poem is longer than that, it ceases to be a single poem and is in fact several poems. The reading of that which is called a long poem makes too much demand upon the totality of effect or impression desired. The unity of the poem is destroyed. From the viewpoint of interest and attention, something similar can be said concerning the sermon. It is doubtful whether the ordinary preacher under ordinary circumstances can sustain interest for more than twenty or thirty minutes. If a sermon is longer than that, it is likely to be several minor sermons held together in a fictitious unity by a passage of Scripture wholly or partially unrelated to the sermon and called the text.

Hence it is the duty of the preacher not merely to condense his material but also to concentrate at certain times upon certain themes. This is the great value of that rhythm of the recurring emphasis of the cardinal doctrines of the church that we find in the Christian Year. This emphasis permits us to treat certain themes in their proper and respective seasons. At the same time each sermon shall have enough of the *Christ Who Died For Us* to give it a truly evangelical character.

6 *The Philosophy of Composition. The Poetic Principle.*

The Christian Year gives to the preacher of the Gospel a right proportion in all things. It is the heritage that he has received from the holy, catholic, and apostolic church and as a wise steward he shall cherish this heritage. The mythical Baptist parson who deigned to preach on every text in the Scripture and yet to no text gave anything but an immersionist interpretation had no sense of the proportion of the Christian faith, either as recorded in the Sacred Scriptures or as exemplified in the seasons of the Christian Year.

In the providence of God, the important matters of faith, that is the Person of the Redeemer, justification by faith, the Christian life, to mention only a few, receive the fuller treatment in the Scriptures that they deserve. The less important subjects receive less consideration. A wise preacher will follow the Scriptures when he turns to that emphasis of the one Gospel which he desires.

To give a sharper, clearer vision to this perspective, he will need a volume of systematic theology. (If he has bought no new one since he left the Seminary, let him use the one of Henry Eyster Jacobs. This might not be better than his own—but let him have one!) Along with the knowledge of the liturgical literature of the Lutheran Church he must know something of the history of the Christian Year. The preacher of the Gospel ought to know the important facts of its development. He ought to know something of its structure and everything connected with its proper use. He should have grasped a good portion of its spirit and lived by its grace. Its proper emphasis, gained from the regular re-occurrence of festivals and special seasons for more than a thousand years will help any preacher, whether he be thirty, fifty, or even seventy years old, to have a "right judgment in all things."

What has gone before has in a sense been preparatory, for we have been concerned primarily with the preacher in his study. He is now ready to go from the sacristy to the pulpit. In the sermon as such, his preliminary studies have been of real value to him. For he must realize that to preach the Gospel is not just a matter of explaining the Scriptures, regardless of how many dark sayings he may have found during the week upon which he ought to throw light. Even the advocates of expository preaching forget that in this kind of preaching there is an obvious danger. Both those who misunderstand the real purpose of preaching as well as those who are not adept in homiletical mechanics will often believe that expository preaching is merely explaining the meaning of the Scriptures. In the best sense of the word, all Gospel preaching is more than that. First and last of all, it is "preaching for a verdict."⁷

7 In an otherwise excellent article on "American Lutheran Preaching" in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* for October 1939, Dr. T. Benton Peery makes this statement

The pericopes ought to be used generally as the basis for the sermon for those who move within the framework of the Christian Year. These should be selected if for no other reason than to keep clergymen from seeking that which is merely novel and unique. Naturally this injunction does not limit the preacher in the selection of his text to the series of the ancient church, though these pericopes ought to be read every Lord's Day at the altar. They remain—however sad the commentary may be upon those in the pew—a Layman's Bible even in the age of printing.

There are certain passages of Scripture in the series of the ancient church that, used as a text for a sermon, will not always be for the edification of the Christian congregation. The Epistle for Laetare, which is an indication that Saint Paul at times used the allegorical method, is a *crux homiletica*. If a preacher wishes to use it for a sermon, he must lay violent hands upon it. If he does not do that and honestly tries to make his congregation understand what Saint Paul really meant, he will mystify his congregation more by his correct interpretation than he would have done by his mis-interpretation. At best his congregation will hardly understand him. There are other passages of Scripture which mean little if anything to the average congregation of today which is exceedingly deficient in a detailed knowledge of the Scriptures. Apart from one or two verses in the Epistle for the 12th Sunday after Trinity, the whole passage, with its sonorous phrases concerning the "glory that was to be done away" and the "glory that excelleth," will demand such complete explanation that the preacher will find that his congregation is weary before he can really begin his sermon.

In the past voices have been raised for a revision of the ancient series. The various series that are listed in the Common Service Book are an attempt either to supplement or supplant the old pericopes of the Western church. If there is to be any revision, it should be made only through the co-operation of the whole Lutheran Church in America. Our liturgical unity—which actually exists in the Common Service Book—ought not be destroyed by one synodical body acting alone. The Common Service of the Lutheran Church in America has become the common property of all synods, for, even though it is not as yet acknowledged as such, it is the product of a common inheritance.⁸

(p. 413): "The fact that the Gospel Lessons are more familiar than the Epistle Lessons shows that the Gospels for the day are usually preached upon. Ours is a gospel-preaching church." The author of these lines does not make it clear that using a pericope from one of the Gospels as a basis for a particular sermon may be a quite different thing from *preaching the Gospel*. The old adage, *to preach the Gospel is to preach from the Epistles*, might in many cases be much nearer the truth.

8 A case in point is the practice of the Augustana Synod. In the Hymnal of that body the common liturgical forms of English-speaking Christians, fixed through the influence of the Church of England, are changed by substituting "Holy Spirit" for "Holy

There is no doubt but that the other series found in the Common Service Book will give a desirable freshness to our preaching if texts are selected from them as the bases for our sermons. The sermon on the temptation of Jesus which is the Gospel for the First Sunday in Lent is valuable for a renewed study of our Lord's messianic consciousness, but the other pericopes offer similar material that is quite valuable. The Eisenach Gospel for this Sunday, in Matthew 16:21-26, shows how Jesus was tempted by Peter and how He met that temptation and refused to flee from suffering. The Hannoverian Gospel, Luke 22:31-44, shows Jesus in His agony in the garden. His suffering appeared to Him under the guise of a cup of trembling and fury. To refuse to drink it was, humanly speaking, to place His wisdom and will in opposition to God's will. This was a temptation to save His people from their sin and to save Himself from suffering. Jesus met it, as He met all the rest, by submitting to God's will.⁹

No one would suggest that because of this great variety, the preacher need be limited to these texts. Modern times have imposed new conditions

Ghost." The Creeds, the New Testament Benediction, and the Gloria Patri have been changed in conformity with this. The old doxology seems to have escaped. Perhaps no poet was found ingenious enough to make the change.

9 The following themes, based on the pericopes for the various series for Whitsunday and Whitmonday (a day that has only historical significance for the Lutheran Church in America), are listed to indicate how varied might be the treatment of the person and mission of the Holy Ghost. A like list might be compiled for any other festival or season of the Church Year.

(1) *The Ancient Series.* Acts 2:1-13: The Gift of the Holy Ghost. John 14:23-31: The Comforter or The Spirit of Remembrance. Acts 10:42-48: The Spirit Of Missionary Work. John 3:16-21: Judgment Through Light.

(2) *The Church Book Series.* Joel 2:28-32: Pentecost, The Fulfillment of Prophecy. Ephesians 4:7-16: The Ascension Gift Realized in the Church. John 14:15-21: The Spirit of Truth. Isaiah 32:14-20: The Spirit of The New Order. Acts 2:42-47: The Results of Pentecost. John 4:5-26: God Is A Spirit.

(3) *The Thomasian Series.* Isaiah 44:1-6: The Spirit of Blessing. Hebrews 8:8-11: God's New Covenant. John 7:37-39: The Spirit of Life. Ezekiel 30:22-28: God Works In Human Life. Acts 2:22-39: The Fulfillment of the Promise. John 4:19-24: See the Church Book series.

(4) *The Hannoverian Series.* Isaiah 62: Salvation Cometh To Zion. Ezekiel 36:22-28: The Renewing Spirit. Ephesians 1:3-23: Sealed By the Spirit of Promise. Acts 8:14-25: Not Bought With A Price. John 15:1-7: The Church—The Union Of Vine and Branches. Isaiah 54:7-13: God's Enduring Covenant. Jeremiah 31:31-34: See Hebrews 8:8-11 in the Thomasian Series. Ephesians 2:13-22: Our Access To The Father Through The Spirit. Acts 19:1-8: Ignorant Of The Holy Ghost. John 15:8-16: The Fruit Of The Branches.

(5) *The Eisenach Series.* Ezekiel 36:22-28: See the Hannoverian series. Ephesians 2:10-22: This is practically the same as the Hannoverian series. John 14:15-21: See the Church Book series. Isaiah 44:1-6: See The Thomasian series. Ephesians 4:11-16: See the Church Book series. John 15:9-16: See the Hannoverian series.

which every pastor must face and he can not be unmindful of them when he enters his pulpit. These times-out-of-joint bring to his mind problems that need his solution regardless of whether there is a text suitable either in the Gospel or the Epistle assigned for that Sunday. One who is learned in the traditions of his church and has a genuine conviction concerning the importance of the Gospel of sin and grace for these problems will have no difficulty. He will seek to solve modern problems in the light of the Gospel and in the framework of the Christian Year.¹⁰

Even the Christian Year, which seems so timeless, is affected by the changes that occur in the life of the church. The Lutheran Church in America is in the best sense of the word a people's church (*eine Volkskirche*). Its success in doing the Lord's work depends to a great extent upon the constant support of its constituency. For that reason the great missionary, eleemosynary, and educational work of the church demand time and opportunity for the presentation of these causes to our congregations. The leaders of the church have sought to fit these causes into the scheme of the Christian Year. Foreign Missions seems best suited for the Epiphany season. Septuagesima Sunday has been selected for the presentation of the deaconess work. For less obvious reasons, it seems, the month of February is assigned to the Board of American Missions and the month of April to the Board of Education. While each of these causes has its own merit and while Christians will wish to see every board of the church adequately supported, there is a danger that in all of this our emphasis will shift from the proclamation of the Eternal Christ to the work of His church. A renewed study of the church and its mission, the constant study of the theology of the church, as well as a better appreciation of the Christian Year will prevent us from making our preaching a presentation of causes.

As trite as it seems to sound, those who preach the Gospel ought to be reminded that they dare preach nothing else than the whole Gospel. Even this statement may well be misleading. A man may regularly preach

10 The following list of subjects may not be suggested by any of the series of pericopes but may be desirable for use from time to time. Those who are interested in the relationship of the Gospel message to modern times and conditions would have no difficulty in extending this list:

(1) The Christian and Amusements. (2) The Origin of the Bible. (3) Luther's Catechism. (4) Confirmation—a rite of the Church. (5) The Creeds and Confessions. (6) The Sacraments. (7) The Institution of Baptism. (8) Infant Baptism. (9) Prayer. (10) The Lord's Prayer. (11) The Family Altar. (12) The Lord's Day. (13) Christian Education. (14) The Christian and War. (15) The Christian Solution of Labor Problems. (16) The Liturgy. (17) Martin Luther and His Hymns. (18) Christian Stewardship. (19) Marriage and the Home. (20) Unionism and Theological Indifference. (21) The Office of the Keys. (22) The Lutheran Church—its History and Doctrines. (23) Worthy Reception of Lord's Supper. (24) Privileges and Duties of Church Members. (25) Patriotic Occasions.

on sin and condemnation, on grace and salvation, and yet be lacking in his duty. For preaching the Gospel is not just preaching on certain themes even though they may seem to contain the very heart of the Gospel. The Christian Year helps every preacher solve this paradox.

When he preaches the whole Gospel and does it within the rhythmic framework of the Christian Year, his Gospel has a varied sound though it is the same and never changes. That which makes it applicable and ever new is that its emphasis varies according to the time of the festival or season of the year. That is the contribution of 1900 years of Christian history and the rich experience of the church.

The preacher of the Gospel can never forget that this Gospel is in a sense inseparably bound to history, for the revelation of God took place in history. The record of this revelation is definitely bound by historical connections and conditions, by historical cultures, and by the environment of the world into which the Gospel first came. In a sense, every believer must become a contemporary with the historical Jesus in order that the eternal Christ, who is the same, may come to him in Word and Sacrament.

THE OBJECTIVE NATURE OF PROPHECY ACCORDING TO II PETER

WILLIAM H. COOPER

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

IT HAS long been recognized that II Peter 1:20 (R.V., "no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation"; Greek text, "*pasa prophēteia graphēs idias epiluseōs ou ginetai*") is a crux of the commentators. Unanimity has not been reached even in the twentieth century. Verse 21 (R.V., "for no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit") is usually regarded as being exegetical of verse 20 and lends itself to the interpretation which many scholars have offered, namely, that the origin of prophecy lies not in the prophet's own mind but in the Divine Mind; that the divine initiative precedes every human expression of the Word of God; and that the phrase "private interpretation" means either (1) that the prophet's individual imagination is incapable of creating or originating the message which he brings¹ or (2) that the prophet

1 So Oecumenius, De Wette, and Knapp, quoted by Meyer. So also Luther in his *Exposition of the Eighty-second Psalm*, Farrar in *The Early Days of Christianity*, J. R. Lumby in *The Expositors' Bible*, Weidner in *Lutheran Commentary*, Alfred Plummer in *Ellicott's Commentary*, Plumptre, Weymouth in his *New Testament in Modern Speech*. J. A. Selbie in *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible* is doubtful but inclines to this view. S. J. Case in the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* is doubtful.

is unable to give an exhaustive or sufficient explanation, in his own time and circumstances, of his message as a whole, the message being intended for future ages and future generations as well as for his own contemporaries.²

If this view of II Peter 1:20 be accepted two other possible interpretations will be excluded. The first of these alternative views is that no prophecy of the scriptures is self-explanatory or accompanied by *its own* interpretation; that only the fulfillment which it undergoes in subsequent time makes really clear its inherent meaning.³ The other possible interpretation of 1:20 holds that no prophecy of the scriptures is to be subject to the individual verdicts of the original hearers or of subsequent readers of the message. This last view is a favorite one among Roman Catholic commentators but it is shared by many Protestant scholars down to our own time.⁴ Roman Catholics urge at this point that the church is to be regarded as the sole interpreter of scripture, a conception which as a matter of fact emerges nowhere in the New Testament and is historically due to the rise of the heresies of the second century.⁵ Protestant commentators accepting this last named view of our passage place emphasis on the Holy Spirit as the true interpreter while they naturally refuse to restrict His guidance to a particular church, least of all the papacy. Their thesis is that the individual believer guided by the Spirit can reach the plain sense of scripture, but that the Spirit is indispensable to the readers as He was in the beginning to the sacred writers.

The question before us in this study is not which of these various conceptions is true, but which is the idea to be drawn by an accurate exegesis from II Peter 1:20. The style of II Peter lacks the logical precision of Paul and reflects none of the culture of Luke or of the writer of

2 This is the interpretation of R. H. Strachan in *The Expositor's Greek Testament* and of John Puleston Jones in his study of inspiration, *Until the Day Dawn* (The Davies Lecture for 1909, Boston and London: 1913). It is also suggested in the margin of R. V., "special" instead of "private," II Peter 1:20.

3 This was the view of Werenfels already in the eighteenth century and of Brückner, both quoted by Meyer.

4 Including Bede, Erasmus, Luther, Weisinger, Besser, Hofmann, all quoted by Meyer; also Grimm, Bigg in *The International Critical Commentary*, J. H. Jowett, Wohlenberg in Zahn's *Kommentar zum N. T.*, Moffatt in the *Moffatt New Testament Commentary* and in his well known Translation, and Goodspeed in his Translation.

5 The Roman interpretation of *idias epiluseōs* is that which is taught "contra eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum" (quoted by Wohlenberg from Session IV of the Council of Trent). It is somewhat surprising to find Moffatt commenting as follows: "It is implied that the Spirit belongs to the church where the apostolic testimony is preserved" (*Moffatt New Testament Commentary*, 1928). This is leading second century church history back into the New Testament.

Hebrews. Moffatt characterizes it as one of "cumbrous obscurity."⁶ Sanday calls it "strained and turgid."⁷ Even if these estimates are unduly severe the obscurities of II Peter remain perpetually provocative. The beloved brother, Paul, was not the only writer of the age from whose pen had come "things hard to be understood." We must be prepared, therefore, in this investigation for the possibility of arriving at no certain conclusion. Our aim is to discover, if we can, some fundamental reasons for accepting one or other of the several current expositions of the passage.

I find one such clue not in the commentators but among the Greek grammarians, A. T. Robertson and W. Hersey Davis, in their *New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* (New York: 1931). They remind us that the old ablative ending in the singular is the same as the genitive and that the *casus ablativus* is the "whence" case, expressing origin or separation. As a "clearly ablative" case in the predicate after the copula *ginetai* they go on to cite II Peter 1:20, which they translate, "no prophecy comes of private disclosure."⁸ If our perplexing word *Epiluseōs* is clearly an ablative everything else becomes sufficiently clear and II Peter is relieved of the accusation of turgidity at least in this place. The otherwise unaccountable use of *ginetai* instead of *esti* is explained and Bigg⁹ is shown to be wrong in his labored argument to prove that *ginetai* here means nothing more than *esti*. In verse 20 as in verse 21 the writer of the epistle is discussing the divine origin and the divinely objective character of prophecy. He is trying to say that when the prophets sought to interpret intelligibly to men the will and purpose of God they did not fall back upon their own ingenuity or trust to their own calculations. They "untied" the knots of the divine mysteries, but not on their own initiative or with their own skill. Not only the truths which they knew but the words in which they taught and the expositions which they offered, were given to them by the Spirit.¹⁰ Prophecy, according to II Peter 1:20, is itself the result of a divinely directed and inspired thought-process going on in the prophet's mind. The prophet earnestly busies himself in unravelling and putting into communicable form the mysteries of God.¹¹ But this spiritual and intellectual activity of the prophet is in a real sense God-impelled. Neither in origin nor in direction is it "his own."¹² The fruit of God's inspiration and of the

6 In his *Introduction*, p. 364.

7 In his *Bampton Lectures on Inspiration*, third edition (London: 1903), p. 349.

8 Page 233, Paragraph 344 (b).

9 In the *International Critical Commentary*, 1901.

10 Compare I Peter 1:10-12 and I Corinthians 2-13.

11 The key to *Epiluseōs* in II Peter 1:20 is obviously in I Peter 1:10, 11. If I Peter is by a different writer than II Peter the harmony is still more striking.

12 Compare John 7:16, "My doctrine is not mine."

prophets' labor to understand and to expound is an objective prophecy¹³ which becomes then the nucleus of an authoritative scripture. The apparent obscurity of II Peter 1:20, thus relieved by new grammatical insight, is due not to inaccuracy on the part of the author but to the fact that his thought is tightly compressed and needs to be expanded in order to be expounded. For II Peter prophecy *is* interpretation, and a prophet's interpretation is his prophecy. The idea of interpreting or misinterpreting *scripture* comes to the fore in chapters two and three of the epistle and does not belong to the exegesis of 1:20.¹⁴

The objective nature of prophecy and hence of all scripture truth is thus seen to be the teaching of this epistle. Regardless of the doubts prevalent among scholars as to the genuineness and authenticity of II Peter it will be conceded on all hands that this conception of both prophecy and scripture is apostolic. It agrees with what we know of the teaching of Jesus. Two practical questions press upon us today which may well receive light from the teaching of II Peter, and with a consideration of these we conclude this study. The first is, "What shall be the attitude of Lutherans and others who still wish to be guided and checked in their thinking by the prophetic and apostolic scriptures of the Old and New Testaments towards the modern critical study of the scriptures themselves?" We do not seek here to give a comprehensive answer to this question but simply to state a few thoughts in regard to it as suggested by II Peter 1:20, 21.

In the first place it will be seen that criticism is a method by which modern men, Christians as well as others, undertake to interpret the scriptures as the historical record of the prophetic and apostolic word. Criticism is concerned primarily with the records and only secondarily with the persons and messages which stand behind the records.¹⁵ The origin and content of the Divine Message which has taken form in historically conditioned scriptures is beyond the ken of criticism. It is the function of criticism to deal with prolegomena; it is the function of theology to deal with the *Word* of God. If the revelation alleged to come from God is thoroughly objective in origin and content, it must be treated objectively by those who seek to ascer-

13 In Genesis 40:8 we have God-given interpretations which are at the same time prophecies. The commentators are right in pointing to Aquila's rendering of "interpretation" by *Epilusis* in Genesis as in harmony with its use by II Peter. The LXX renders Genesis 40:8 by *diasaphēsis*.

14 J. Puleston Jones thinks the Epistle would make a complete whole without chapter 2 (*Until The Day Dawn*, p. 306).

15 When one reads, for example, a dictionary article like that on the Beatitudes in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* one becomes painfully aware of this. Many of the commentaries have also fallen into this rut—too much criticism and too little theology.

tain its content, even while its historical forms may be sifted, compared and re-arranged by critical methods.

How well this may be done, and with what results may be seen in such an example as George Adam Smith's beautiful and effective chapter on "The Spirit of Christ in the Old Testament" in his well known book, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*.¹⁶ If Smith had looked for a text to head this chapter he could have found nothing better than II Peter 1:20, 21. Proceeding on the assumption that modern critical conclusions on the Old Testament may be fearlessly accepted by believing preachers, he has no difficulty in demonstrating that those critical conclusions have in no way hindered us from seeing even in the Song of Deborah and in David's Lament over Saul the Spirit of Christ in the Old Testament, i.e., a spirit, a content, and a message which *could not have originated* out of the mind of unaided, uninspired men and women in the same situation as Deborah and David. The increased historical knowledge which criticism may give us of times and records merely verifies in a concrete way the teaching of a book like II Peter on the whole subject of prophecy. It remains true, of course, that many Lutherans today are unready to accept the critical positions held by Sir George Adam Smith forty years ago. The point we are trying to make here is that critical methods have left prophecy standing unaltered in its essentially objective nature.

Another question which presses upon us today is that of the traditional Protestant "right of private judgment" which now as always in the past is powerfully challenged by Rome. The Romanist urges that only the Church of Peter can adequately and authoritatively interpret for us the Epistles of Peter together with all the rest of the scriptures. Those of us who stand in the Lutheran tradition can feel the force of this. We believe and have experienced that our own church has nourished and fostered in us an understanding of the scriptures such as we could scarcely have gained in many lifetimes of earnest searching, unaided by the Lutheran Church. Where then do we stand on the right of private judgment? And how can we hope to show that the Roman tradition cannot do for its people what ours has done for us?

The answer comes again from the Petrine teaching as to the objective nature of all prophecy. This doctrine and Rome's proud "*securus judicat orbis terrarum*" have nothing in common. As Calvin has keenly observed in his commentary on II Peter 1:20, the judgment of the whole world, if it is opposed to God's revelation is nothing but an "individual" or "private" opinion.¹⁷ When a church has declined from the purity and ardor of its first

16 Lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation at Yale, 1899. Second edition, 1901.

17 Calvin says: "Ergo ut totus mundus in unum conspiraret, cunctaque hominum ingenia simul coalescant, quicquid tamen inde prodibit, privatum erit vel proprium, quia nomen hoc divinae revelationi opponitur."

love as even the apostolically founded and nurtured church of Ephesus did very early,¹⁸ and which all churches periodically do, there come times when awakened individual teachers within the church, a Luther, or a Cranmer,¹⁹ or a Harms, or a Spener, or a Barth must choose. Shall they abide by the church's traditional or current teaching concerning Scripture and its application to Christian life or shall they obey some new and better insight which God has granted to the individual teacher, some fresh discovery of a neglected aspect of the objective Word? It remains true that the most highly gifted or enlightened teacher of the Word may not subject its sense in any way to his own will or choice. If he does he will be discredited in due time. But it remains equally true that one man may rightly differ from the whole church if by earnest objective search he has ascertained and proposes to abide by the message of the Scriptures which the church has failed to incorporate in her teaching and life. This is what we understand by the right of private judgment. It is the individual's right to guard the objective nature of the Divine Word against all comers, under the guidance of the same Spirit by which the Word was first imparted to holy men of God.

18 Revelation 2:4.

19 I refer to his final break with the Romanized Church of England which led immediately to martyrdom, March 21, 1556.

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS¹

The Study of Theology. Edited by K. E. Kirk. New York: Harper and Bros., 1939. viii, 484 pages. \$5.

Mr. Nathaniel Micklem includes this among the ten great theological books published during the year 1939. It is produced by a group of eleven distinguished scholars, mostly professors at Oxford University, each one of whom discusses one phase of the study of theology. It must be evident that the discussions had to be limited, for on each subject volumes have been written. The aim of the study is a very practical one. The editor may be allowed to state that aim: "We have addressed ourselves, in the first instance, to the educated layman or laywoman, to the cultivated Christian, whose professional or general training has endowed him or her with a reasonably ample and satisfying fund of secular knowledge, but who is conscious of a depressing and confusing lack of information concerning that which should be, for those who profess it, the very centre and foundation upon which life itself is built, namely, the Christian religion. We have not, indeed, wished to exclude from our purview the needs of ministers of religion, or of students who are in training for the ministry of any Christian body; and on this account have as far as possible paid particular attention to the most recent developments in each department of theological study."

One can not but feel gratified if this book appeals to lay people to get a general view of the problems, methods and, in part at least, conclusions of theology. It was noticed that after the Oxford Conference many, even of the lay folk, felt an urge to its study. In bringing to the attention of ministers of religion and theological students "the most recent developments in each department of theological study," the book also should meet a real need.

The departments of theological study that are covered in this discussion are:

- I. What is Theology? by Dr. N. P. Williams, Oxford professor of Divinity.
- II. Comparative Religion, by Dr. E. O. James, professor of the Philosophy and History of Religion.
- III. The Philosophy of Religion, by Father M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., master of Champion Hill, Oxford.
- IV. The Psychology of Religion, by Dr. L. W. Grensted, professor of the Philosophy of Religion.
- V. The Old Testament, by Dr. Herbert Danby, professor of Hebrew.
- VI. The New Testament, by Dr. C. H. Dodd, professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
- VII. Symbolic Theology, by the late Dr. H. L. Goudge, professor of Divinity.
- VIII. The History of Christian Doctrine, by Nathaniel Micklem, principal of Mansfield College.
- IX. Ecclesiastical History, by Dr. A. H. Thompson, professor of History, Leeds.
- X. Moral Theology, by the editor, Dr. K. E. Kirk, bishop of Oxford.
- XI. Christian Worship and Liturgy, by E. C. Ratcliffe, lecturer in Liturgiology.

It will be noticed that most of the subjects generally studied in a theological course are treated. It should also be noticed that while most of the essayists are members of the Church of England, non-conformists also are included among them, and even a

¹ Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be secured through the United Lutheran Publication House, 1228 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Roman Catholic. The book may thus serve to some extent as an illustration of the ecumenicity which is now on the lips of many.

It would be impossible to review all of these articles in detail. Attention is called only to the following that may be of help to the readers of this review.

Philosophy of religion, as also its psychology, are stressed as introductions to the study of theology itself. This therefore sets itself against the Barthian standpoint that would look on these as hindrances rather than helps to the study of theology. In the order of the subjects, theology both historical and systematic indeed precede both the philosophy and psychology of religion. This is however arranging them in order of their importance. In an outline of the various sciences commonly grouped under the comprehensive title of 'theology,' as stated by Dr. Williams, the first place in order is given to the intellectual prolegomena of dogmatic theology—the *Philosophy and Psychology of Religion* (p. 12). To this may be added Dr. Grensted's view of his talk in discussing the psychology of religion: that is "to present a positive and coherent account of human nature, its structure and its behaviour, in all its aspects, and to show how these elements in that structure and that behaviour which are more usually termed religious take their natural place in the whole system, and also to point out any indications which lead in the direction of an interpretation of the whole system in terms consonant with what, again, we usually term religion" (p. 152).

Then, too, attention is called to the fact that as regards the Bible the conclusions of recent Biblical criticism are taken for granted. While the conclusions of the more conservative criticism are followed, they would not be acceptable to those who hold to what is now known as the position of fundamentalists and of verbal inspirationalists.

The High Church Anglican position is not at all conspicuous in the discussions in general, but it does seem to appear in two articles. The first is that of symbolic theology. One looks in vain here for any reference to symbols other than the three ecumenical creeds. This, of course, is in accordance with the views of those who believe that only the Creeds of the undivided church are authoritative. The second article to which reference is made is that by the editor himself on moral theology. One would expect Christian ethics to be treated here, but in this he is disappointed. What is discussed, and discussed very fully, is what is called a "*minimum* standard to which conduct must attain if it is to be adjudged worthy of the name Christian" (p. 363). The reading of this article impressed the reviewer as being legalistic rather than the Christian ethics of the Lutheran type—and even that of St. Augustine. It fits the confessional of the Roman Catholic Church rather than the freedom of the children of God.

It ought yet to be added that the articles generally discuss their subjects from the historical side. This is only to be expected, of course, in the subjects that themselves are subjects of history, e.g., ecclesiastical history and history of doctrine. It is apparent, however, also in the treatment of other subjects. The last one on Christian worship and liturgy limits itself almost entirely to the historical.

A book of this kind could not be expected to satisfy every one in all particulars. It is well fitted to meet the needs of those for whom especially it was written. It raises the question whether in this time of a revival of interest in theology, others might not also prepare books intended chiefly for lay folk. Students will find here a helpful introduction to present-day problems of theology. Ministers will find it useful to refresh their knowledge of it and keep it up to date. It may therefore very properly be given a place among the best books on theological learning produced during the past year.

JOHN ABERLY

Die Lehre vom Gottesdienst. By Hans Asmussen. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1937. 294 pages. RM 7.20.

During recent years Hans Asmussen has attracted increasing attention by his succession of thoughtful and valuable studies in the field of liturgy, and also by his works in the department of practical theology. *Die Lehre vom Gottesdienst* is the first work of three which go by the general title, "Gottesdienstlehre." The other volumes deal with the Church Year and the Church Service. The present work is basic for the other two. It proceeds from a strictly Lutheran viewpoint, and has in mind particularly the renewal of worship in the church in Germany in accordance with that position. Its particular purpose also suggests its limitations for the church in America, as the problems discussed are principally local ones.

Die Lehre vom Gottesdienst is divided into three major parts, "Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes," which is theological; "Die Lehre von der Gestaltung," a study in the philosophy of form, and its relation to theology; and "Der christliche Gottesdienst," which is a practical discussion of The Service and its parts, and of Holy Baptism. The theoretical section, which comprises the first two parts, covers considerably more than half of the book. Looking at the work as a whole one misses the definitely historical approach, which must necessarily loom large in a study of worship. Historical considerations are by no means absent, but are subordinated to a theoretical approach.

At the outset the author proceeds from the premise that "Jesus Christ is the sole Word of God." To the Word in this sense must be related all the great elements which have part in the service of the church: the Holy Scriptures, the Sacraments, the proclamation of the church's message, the church's confession, and the church's prayer. These relationships are thoroughly explored and defined in the first section of the book.

The discussion of form comes next. Here the writer takes up the doctrine, the opportunities and tasks, and the expressions of form in the worship-life of the church. One affirmation, that the forms employed by the church in its worship are the forms of a world-lost-in-perdition, makes us ask the question, "Cannot these forms be thought without ethical value, and neutral?" Does not the very fact of the church's use of them unto edification show that?

One plea that arouses the interest of the reader is that made for more congregational participation in the worship. The plea is made in connection with the discussion of the song of the church. The author rightly says that the song ought normally to be common, and that altar-song ought not to be excluded. Fundamentally the plea is one for greater lay-participation in the worship. This is interesting, coming from the church in Germany. Asmussen says that the greatest common participation is in silent prayer, that there is far more participation here than in the recitation of the confession of faith, the Creed! And what he writes about altar-song is very refreshing.

Within the section of the work devoted to the theory of form in the worship of the church come also discussions of the forms in which the external life of the church is clothed: the Christian form of speech, or the way in which the church speaks to the world; the place and meaning of dress and gesture in the church's liturgy; the form of the church building; and the significance in general of the beautiful. Concerning the latter, the author points out with great discernment the large place of the dramatic both in the Gospels and in the worship of the church, and the barrenness which must result from its complete exclusion or neglect. Over and above the simple intelligible message there is the wider area where men enter into Gospel joy and the heavenly glory whose garments take their lines and colors from the board and palette of the divine Artist (pp. 181-184).

Concerning the service itself, the author points out a certain manysidedness, whose basis "is this, that it is a piece of life itself. Indeed, the service (or worship) is, accord-

ing to the belief of Christianity, the culmination of the life of the Christian congregation." What follows is likewise significant. "How may one become a doer of the Word?" asks the author. "One isn't only a doer of the Word when he obeys the Second Table. In order to be a doer of the Word the spiritual act must successively come to pass in my life in all its manysidedness. The church 'does' when it hears. And it is from hearing that knowledge and confession, prayer and hymn, petition and intercession come."

The reader will get both profit and information from the treatment of the parts of The Service, the Church Year, and the administration of the Sacraments. There is a good deal of reference to the variety of practice current in different parts of Germany, which is natural in a book of this kind. Everywhere the discussion is stimulating and illuminating. One can see that many of the improvements and reforms for which the author longs and labors have their parallels in the church in America. Occasionally the author commits himself to statements which might be thought regrettable, but that is bound to occur in a field where, after all the theoretical premises have been taken into account, taste, cultural inheritance, and local custom still play large and perfectly proper rôles. One can enthusiastically recommend the work to all who are interested in the philosophy and conduct of the worship of the church.

GEORGE R. SELTZER

Das Kirchenjahr. By Hans Asmussen. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 2nd edition, 1937. 131 pages. RM 2.60. (Gottesdienstlehre, II Band.)

This volume of Asmussen's trilogy is a series of studies in the Seasons, Festivals, and Sundays of the Church Year, with an extensive Foreword. The explanations seek to interpret the spirit of the festivals, on the basis of the liturgical Epistles and Gospels; but they are not directly exegetical. *Das Kirchenjahr* would make a fine companion volume to Fendt's *Die Allen Perikopen*. Both are suggestive and stimulating. It may be thought, however, that too much is sometimes made of the agreement or disagreement of the pericopes. The danger in this kind of treatment is that too much is read into the appointments, and that a controlling thought or "theme" is discovered where none really exists. It is true that the appointments for the occasions of the Church Year are generally appropriate and fitting; but unless the point is very obvious, it is usually wise not to drag in an alleged "central message." The dangers are those of extreme inventiveness which soon becomes nothing more than striking statement and novelty, and of unreality.

GEORGE R. SELTZER

Ordnung des Gottesdienstes. By Hans Asmussen. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1936. xxxii, 288 pages. RM 8.80. (Gottesdienstlehre, III. Band.)

This volume is a complete book of services for the Sundays and Festivals of the Christian Year. A new method of printing has been adopted by which the services are presented serially throughout the year, with all the variable parts in their places. This differs from the customary arrangement of the "ordinary" and the "propers" which is generally followed in service books. The services are provided with fine musical settings throughout, most of which are Gregorian melodies; full provision is also made for the intonations of the clergyman in settings of the collects, versicles, etc. The work is an excellent piece of printing.

Some of the features which may be noted are the following: for the complete Service, with the celebration of holy communion, the order is as follows after the "Hauptlied": Sermon, Votum; Hymn, announcements, General Prayer; Offertory

("Create in me . . ."); Preface and Proper Preface, Sanctus; Our Lord's Prayer (short form, without doxology); Verba, Agnus Dei; A Prayer to Christ; "O Taste and See" or, "Come, all things are ready"; Distribution; Nunc Dimittis and Post-communion. When the holy communion is not celebrated the order is: Sermon and Votum; Hymn, announcements, General Prayer; Offertory, Sanctus, Our Lord's Prayer, Benedicamus and Benediction.

During the Season of Lent the Litany is appointed in place of the General Prayer. The Nicene Creed is set for Trinity Sunday only, which is surprising to Lutherans in America who are accustomed to its frequent use on Festivals and at communions. An unhappy feature, more or less homiletical in character, is the attachment of thematic names for the Sundays and Festivals throughout the year.

This work is worthy of careful study and attention.

GEORGE R. SELTZER

Their Future Is Now. By Ernest M. Ligon. New York: Macmillan Company, 1939. xv, 369 pages. \$3.

Professor Ligon brings to his studies in the growth and development of Christian personality a background of theological and psychological training together with observation and research in child psychology laboratories of this country, Vienna, Geneva, and London. The title of his present book, *Their Future Is Now*, reveals the point of view which is controlling throughout his entire plan for character building. "There is little doubt that some age levels are more important than others. In general, the younger the child the more effective are efforts at character development. Nevertheless there are problems peculiar to every age level which can be solved best during and only during that particular period of his life" (page 74).

Since every stage of growth is considered significant, the author attacks the problems of character education developmentally; that is, from age level to age level. Each separate treatment sets forth the most important psychological characteristics of the period, ways in which "another layer in the structure of character" can be built in children of that age level, and devices for measuring the status and progress of individuals comprising the group.

There are four distinctive features upon which must rest the significance and practical value of the author's contribution. In the first place, the book sets forth eight definite goals for character development. These the author has derived from an interpretation of the Beatitudes. He contends that they accurately represent the concepts of human personality held by Jesus and that they are productive of strong character and wholesome personality. The first four, classified under experimental faith, are vision, love of righteousness and truth, faith in the friendliness of the universe, and dominating purpose. The next four—being sensitive to the needs of others, forgiveness, magnanimity, Christian courage—are grouped under the title of fatherly love. The contention that paternal love is a more apt description of the central motivation of Jesus' teaching than brotherly love is given interesting substantiation. The eight objectives of character education, with necessary adaptations, receive contemporaneous attention at every level of growth. They are validated on the grounds that they are Christian, mentally wholesome, and socially acceptable.

A minute scrutiny of these goals seems to reveal that certain aspects of the God-man relationship are minimized or overlooked. This may be owing to the author's insistence upon positive Christianity or to his desire to expose all elements in personality to processes of measurement. Apart from the question of inclusiveness, every trait offered is much to be desired in the make-up of Christian personality. Further, it is

conceivable that the development of these traits will lead more surely to a beneficial fellowship with God than any direct method previously employed.

The second feature is the emphasis on individual differences. It is a fundamental assertion that no two children are alike and that character traits have no real meaning except in terms of the personalities possessing them. Character education can be successful only when the leader has an accurate knowledge of the individuals with whom he is concerned. This knowledge is not an item of common sense or of instruction. The author has developed a comprehensive personality profile with approximate methods for the measurement of its various traits and a brief interpretation of their significance. The profile considers physical growth, intellectual development, special aptitudes, character and personality traits. The extent to which this device is usable will depend on the competence of the teacher and the laboratory facilities available. Simple and non-technical methods of measurement can be used for all the traits. Obviously they will not prove so satisfactory as more scientific procedures. A companion volume explaining methods of measurement is about to be published.

The third feature is the effort to measure progress in character. At the end of the discussion of each age level is a questionnaire, dealing with the eight objectives of character in so far as they are sought at that level of growth. "It is proposed that these questionnaires be used when the child arrives at each level, in order to see specifically what aspects of his personality can most profitably be strengthened during that period. They should be applied again at the end of each age level to get a measure of the extent of his progress. These are not instruments for detecting mental disease symptoms. They are designed for use with normal, healthy children. They do not give rise to fears in parents of possible mental breakdowns in their children, but set forth possibilities through which the strength and happiness of their children can be increased" (page viii).

The fourth feature is the presentation of a new method in character education called the "drama-type." This involves the development of curricular units in which each child is placed according to his own abilities and needs. It allows for individualized progress but at the same time safeguards the need for social integration. It is still in the earlier stages of experimentation but gives promise of involving little more administrative complexity than attended the former standardized approach.

The material presented in this book has been successfully experimented with for some years. It offers no easy panacea for social ills or miraculous short-cut to the attainment of Christian personality. It does seek to bring the findings of scientific study to bear upon the process of character building. "Five thousand years of history saw far less change in our use of natural law than the last hundred. When the scientific method began to be applied to natural phenomena, our ability to do great things with them increased enormously. Is human nature any less obedient to the laws of God than nature itself?" (page 362).

O. F. NOLDE

The Opening Doors of Childhood. By Lewis Joseph Sherrill. New York: Macmillan Company, 1939. 193 pages. \$1.75.

It is a pleasure to come across a book about childhood which combines an appreciation of modern procedures and investigations with an equal appreciation of religious realities and processes. Dr. Sherrill's book is written in so easy, sympathetic, and helpful a style that the parents to whom it is addressed can readily find real assistance for the guidance of their children.

The opening sentence of Dr. Sherrill's Foreword accurately describes the book: "This book is written for parents, and deals chiefly with the inner world of children's

experience of God." The author prosecutes his aim by chapters which deal with the child's knowing God—knowing God through stories that are told of Jesus; through the child's parents, especially the father, who the author says often represents to the child his first conception of God; through the wise use of many kinds of everyday experiences; and through the search for a wider understanding of such experiences.

There is a fine chapter on how the parents may make the Bible available to the child. The author italicizes this sentence (page 75): "The Bible is meant to reach children first through the thinking and living of their parents, long before children can understand the relatively mature speech in which the Bible is written." Dr. Sherrill's contention is that it is the parents' business to transmute the adult records of the Bible into forms comprehensible to childhood. "Parents must continue to translate," the author again italicizes (page 80), "for their children, the language as well as the living of the Bible, if the children are to grasp it." This emphasis is timely in view of the current resurgence of Bible study.

There is another helpful chapter, headed "The Inward Struggle," on the whole subject of sin and repentance. The reviewer has read nothing on this subject more appropriate to child life.

The remaining chapters of the book deal with ways "to keep the feeling of being in touch with God" in children. This is to be done through joint family experiences of Bible reading and worship; through prayer; through participation in church worship and church life; and through what the author terms "enlistment," that dedication of one's life to Christ and the church which we Lutherans effect in confirmation (elsewhere, pages 185-188, the author speaks highly of catechetical instruction).

With regard to prayer, Dr. Sherrill goes so far as to grant that children may be taught to look for definite answers to their prayers of petition. In the matter of church-going the author runs counter to the opinion of many today when he says (page 162): "Where a congregation continues to separate the 'church service' from the 'church school,' the parents will regard it as ideal to bring children with them to the church service as early as seems practical. If one had to suggest an age, six seems none too early to begin. And in many places children must be brought in arms if mothers are to come at all. . . . But it is a warning to any congregation if they only can see it, when no children are in the number of those who come before the 'Shepherd of tender youth.'"

The book contains a good many practical helps. Several stories of Jesus are told in child language for the guidance of parents. On page 119 there appears an extensive list of Bible passages usable with children. Not only are references to the actual experiences of children repeatedly made, but often the sources are quoted. A list of helpful books closes the volume.

One leaves this book feeling that any parent who reads it conscientiously must be better able to cultivate the Christian religion in his children; or that parents of small children, meeting in a group, cannot help but profit immensely by its use. Thoroughly adapted as the book is to child needs and the child level, it presents the "opening doors of childhood" as doors through which God Himself will enter into the maturing soul.

THEODORE K. FINCK

Study Helps in the Catechism, Series A. 64 pages. Paper, 40 cents; \$3.85 a dozen.

Study Helps in the Catechism, Series B. 64 pages. Paper, 40 cents; \$3.85 a dozen.

A Guide Book in Catechetical Instruction. 315 pages. \$2.25. By O. Fred Nolde. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1939.

When the catechetical publications of Professor Nolde first appeared in 1932, they were described in some detail for the readers of THE LUTHERAN CHURCH

QUARTERLY by Dr. William L. Katz. Since that time these publications have become so well and favorably known that when they appear in a new edition the reviewer's task for the most part consists in noting the revisions and additions that have been made. Professor Nolde now has four catechetical publications in print: *Truth and Life*, 1937, a sourcebook for catechumens; *Study Helps in the Catechism, Series A*, and *Series B*, two workbooks for catechumens; and *A Guide Book in Catechetical Instruction*, a catechist's manual. These four books constitute a comprehensive and noteworthy series.

The workbook, *Study Helps, Series A*, is identical with the *Study Helps* of 1932 with several exceptions. Whereas formerly two pages were provided near the close of the book for a vocabulary list, the new edition includes a page for a word list in connection with each of the five parts of the catechism. The author offers attractive suggestions for the use of these lists on page eighteen of the new *Guide Book*. A more important change is the addition of a Study Help, inserted as Number Eleven, dealing with the life of Christ. The number of Study Helps is thus increased to twenty-eight.

Study Helps, Series B, is an alternative workbook which follows the same catechetical course and offers the same number of study helps as Series A. The data sheets, examinations, diagrams, and a little of the material (e.g. Study Help No. 3) will be found to be identical. The Daily Bible Readings are different and in some instances the questions are phrased differently; but the chief difference between the two series lies in the fact that Series B follows more closely the development of the catechetical material in *Truth and Life*. For the most part, the Series B workbook by its questions requires the pupil to outline the sourcebook material. Whereas Series A seems at times to require the pupil to find both the source and the answer, Series B proposes questions whose answers are to be found in the sourcebook already provided. Series B makes it possible for a pastor to continue the same course but to alternate the workbooks used—a practice that may be desirable for several reasons. One might hazard the guess that, where there is the willingness to bear the expense of both a sourcebook and a workbook for each pupil, Series B will become the more popular of the two workbooks.

In view of the criticism of these and other workbooks, it may be well to estimate the situation by asking the question, "What are the values in a workbook?" At least five values may be enumerated: (1) to summarize or analyze the lessons; (2) to organize or integrate the content of the lessons; (3) to apply or interpret the lessons in life situations; (4) to provide an opportunity for the expression of the pupil's response or attitude toward the lessons; and (5) to furnish an estimate of the extent of the pupil's study and application.

The first of these aims has its place in catechetical instruction even if the result is that the workbook becomes a sort of copybook. In the cases of pupils with lower I.Q.'s, little more than this can be expected. Series B makes much more use of this aim than does Series A. Thus, in Series B, Study Help No. 4, question 8, "Give three ways. . ."; question 11, "Mention 3 particular benefits. . ."; Study Help No. 5, question 7, "Give three reasons. . .". The answers required are not those in the opinion of the pupil or of the catechist, but those enumerated in *Truth and Life*.

The second aim, namely, to organize and integrate, is necessary for many pupils who fail to see unity or coherence in the catechetical course. Both the Nolde workbooks, by questions and diagrams, contribute toward this aim.

The third value is probably to be expected only of pupils with better intellectual ability. It is possible that this aim is served better by Series A. The Daily Bible Readings in both series may be considered as contributing to this end. However, in view of the fact that the superior pupils are in a minority, the question may be raised whether it would not be better to supply the themes of the readings.

The fourth aim is quite difficult of attainment. It is important to avoid hypocrisy. Hence caution must be exercised in using such questions as numbers six and eight in Study Help No. 10, Series A ("Do you believe. . . ?").

Where the aim is to ascertain the extent of the pupil's preparation, the workbook will not only be an aid to the teacher but will also provide the pupil with a sense of accomplishment. Yet it runs the risk of substituting a mechanical for an intellectual achievement. Both series provide this value and run this danger.

The *Guide Book* as now issued is larger by 137 pages than was the 1932 edition. The enlargement is to be accounted for by slight revisions in the instructions to the catechist, by the insertion of pages of answers opposite the questions of each study help in Series A, and by the addition of Series B (also provided with pages of answers). Incidentally, these pages of suggested answers are an added convenience in the lives of busy pastors.

The revisions in the instructions to the catechist are, for the most part, such as were made necessary by the publication of *Truth and Life*, by revisions in the workbook which now becomes Series A, and by the addition of Series B. At the end of the first chapter, "For the Pastor's Preliminary Study," the author has added some helpful suggestions for the effective use of the workbooks. Also, the reader ought not overlook a footnote on page 73 calling attention to lantern slides illustrating the Commandments.

On page seventy of the new *Guide Book* is to be found a long paragraph added to the text of the first edition. In this paragraph the author justifies his employment of the second and third classical uses of the law. When he writes, "(1) The life of the Christian ought to be determined by a spirit of (!) attitude," we interpret the statement in terms of the sentence found a little further on: "They (the Ten Commandments) are really illustrations of ways in which the Christian can express his inner attitude or spirit." But it is something else to read a second sentence later: "However, obedience to them (the Commandments) will ultimately lead to the spirit which ought to become controlling."

There are other minor matters in which some might have desired a change, as, for example, a list of more recent books on adolescent psychology. But the major purpose of the book is splendidly achieved, an accomplishment we gratefully acknowledge. Among the objectives of catechetical instruction Professor Nolde includes this: that catechumens should understand the Christian teachings and respond to them in a definitely Christian way. The suggestions and devices offered for securing such responses constitute the most significant contribution of Professor Nolde's publications—a contribution no alert catechist dare overlook. The older catechetical manuals were almost entirely lacking in efforts to connect faith and life; they provided information without motivation. However, an experience-centered course runs the risk of becoming a mere verbalization of adolescent experience—like an airplane that runs well over the field but never gets above the earth. The limited experience of adolescents must not become the criterion of catechetical instruction if the other-worldly aspects of Christianity are to have adequate presentation. In avoiding these extremes the Nolde publications are markedly successful in combining the informational with the experiential in catechetical instruction. The church must view with satisfaction this further publication of these materials.

WILLARD D. ALLBECK

Human Relationships and the Church: A Study of Present-Day Social Problems. By Walton H. Greever, D.D., LL.D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1939. 96 pages. \$1.

Into the making of this timely volume the author has brought the rich fruitage of earnest thought on social problems, ripened out of his long experience as a churchman,

a teacher of theology, a writer and editor of church periodicals, and a student of Christian ethics. As secretary of the United Lutheran Church in America and as chairman of the Commission on "The Church in the World" of the Lutheran World Convention, he has been in close touch with the throbbing life of the church and has become thoroughly conversant with the complex problems which the church faces today. Out of this experience he has produced a series of studies which is undoubtedly destined to become a guide in the church for many years to come.

Approaching his studies with Scripture in mind, Dr. Greever indicates, first of all, a number of basic "facts concerning humanity which are indisputable in validity, timeless in significance, and universal in pertinence, in which certain vital principles are involved for application everywhere, at all times, under all circumstances or conditions." In the list of facts he includes references to the nature of man, social life, sex, race, government, labor, education, religion, and the universal yearning for immortality. To these he adds certain other facts regarding God's dealing with sinful humanity, redemption, the church, and the social order with which the church has to deal. These facts he regards as fundamental in Christian social action. So succinctly does he state the principles and truisms regarding social problems that the reader is compelled to study carefully each sentence in order to grasp the full implication of the analysis set forth.

True to his thesis, the author holds the church responsible for the application of Christian principles to social situations, for the fostering of human brotherhood, and for the motivation of Christian stewardship. His observations concerning present-day preaching are fresh and informing. The preaching engendered by the New Testament, he affirms, is heraldical, interpretative, didactic, evangelistic, prophetic, authenticative, and vitalistic. Particularly pointed is his chapter setting forth parallel theses on the nature, spheres, and function of the church and the state.

This compact volume of facts and principles will serve as an excellent textbook for use in colleges, seminaries, ministerial associations, conferences, institutes, and study groups in the churches. It will prove very helpful as a guide to pastors in the preparation of sermons dealing with social problems. It is so clear and factual that it will not only satisfy the minds of men in all branches of the Lutheran Church, but it will also commend itself to pastors and leaders of thought in other denominations of Christendom.

E. E. FLACK

Two Minutes With God. A Book of Devotions for Homes with Children. By Paul J. Hoh and Philip R. Hoh. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1940. 175 pages. \$1.50.

Here is a book for family devotions which enters a field which is not crowded, namely, devotions with young children. The authors are father and son and the method of their collaboration is set forth in the foreword as follows: "One day, when my boy was about twelve, I suggested to him that we try to prepare such a volume. He took up the idea with an interest that was astounding. For several years, in spare moments, we have worked happily on the project. Many of the topics chosen are the lad's suggestions; many of the Bible verses are his selections; some of the language is expressive of his thought; and a number of the prayers are his own creation. The product of our combined efforts is this little volume."

The authors have set three standards for children's devotions which are admirably maintained in the book: brevity, simplicity of language, and "thought content within the range of children's interests and needs." The book contains five meditations on each of thirty-one different topics such as: Jesus, God, Prayer, Church, School, Play, Illness, Sin, Courage, Birds, Food, Heaven, Festivals, Birthdays. Each meditation begins with a Bible passage and closes with a brief, simple prayer.

The only way to review and judge such a book as this which has come out of actual use and experience is to use it in family worship with growing children. This your reviewer has done, and it is recommended without qualification. Pastors will welcome this book and suggest its use by families with children in their congregations. One wonders, however, why this unique volume did not appear under the imprint of our own publication house, since the cry so long has been that we have no Lutheran authors.

JOHN W. DOBERSTEIN

Forty Thousand Strong. A Study Book for Church Councilmen. By Henry H. Bagger. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1939. 64 pages. Paper, 15 cents; \$1.50 a dozen.

A great criticism of the old-fashioned revival was that it effected "conversion" without roots: when its emotional stir subsided, so did the "convert."

Our recent Church Councilmen's Conferences were designed to inspire, but they were *planned* inspiration with a follow-up. That follow-up is this fine discussion series, designed by Dr. Bagger as a study book for church councils.

Here in a span of some sixty vital pages the lay leader's position, responsibilities, and potential power for Christ are unfolded. First the author locates the councilman with reference to the United Lutheran Church and its "Forty Thousand" like him. Then the historical development of his office is traced. An outline is given for effective organization of council, committees, congregation, and work program. The duties drawn from the Order for Installation are developed and illustrated. There is practical advice on *Calling and Keeping a Pastor*, *The Business of Buildings and Budgets*, and the co-operation of the local congregation with the church-at-large in apportionment and the Calendar of Causes. Hard-headed, plain spoken, it is a business-like pastor speaking to a business man. As such it is effective.

Yet its virtue does not end here, for the theme of the book runs deeper than details of history and management. It is discerned in a closing sentence: "You are to be men of God and not mere administrators." If this message, as set down in the chapter, *The Gospel "Bound in Shoe Leather"* is learned truly at the study tables of our church councils, through their leadership our generation will have a clearer interpretation of Christ and His church. And the author reminds us that no personal limitations prevent service. "Start with what you've got; increase your investment; lean on the Lord."

Church councils who really *use* this book will find education and inspiration at the conference table with them. I recommend it heartily.

W. ROBERT MILLER

Let Not Your Heart Be Troubled. By James Dalton Morrison. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1938. 64 pages. Paper, 40 cents; Deluxe, \$1.

Thirty selections of comfort and courage, each composed of a passage of Scripture, a prose or poetical quotation, and a prayer, constitute this little volume. The choice of material is excellent; the spirit of the book genuinely Christian; the format attractive. A good book to place into the hands of persons who have been separated from loved ones by death. A helpful book for the pastor on his errands of consolation.

PAUL J. HOH

New Testament History. By W. Arndt. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939. 102 pages. Paper, 25 cents. (Instructor's Guide, 56 pages, \$1. Test Sheets, 10 cents.)

New Testament History is a well-written, lucid, concise yet fairly complete narrative of the life of Jesus and of the development of the church from Pentecost to A. D. 100. Occasionally the simple narrative is interrupted by a brief, conservative discussion of critical problems. The book was prepared as a unit in the teacher-training curriculum for Sunday-school teachers of the Missouri synod and its allied groups. It will serve its purpose admirably. It will be valuable, too, to the average Christian church member who desires a bird's-eye view of New Testament history. The Instructor's Guide furnishes needed directions for the conduct of a leadership class, together with answers to all questions found on the Test Sheets. The tests—preliminary, chapter, and final—are all of the true-false type.

PAUL J. HOH

The Eternal Voice. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. New York: Abingdon Press, 1940. 260 pages. \$2.

Here is a wholesome collection of sermons preached by Leslie D. Weatherhead from the pulpit of the City Temple in London. The book gets its name from the opening sermon which presents the theme. It is that the "confused welter of happenings in the world" and the "conflicting impulses and feelings" within men's breasts will carry for them a message. Those who live close to God will "detect a thread of purpose running through both the things that God wills, like sunshine and bird-song and health and love; and the things that God allows, like sorrow and war and pain and poverty and frustration and evil." Again and again the reader catches that theme. The writer tries to trace the sound of the Eternal Voice in the affairs of men and everyday life and make it audible for them. That is the guiding purpose in every chapter.

No doubt the chief interest for the preacher, especially if he has read any of Weatherhead's books and knows of his work in the field of Christian Psychology, will be to study the technique of the psychologist in the pulpit. Here is a good example of what he preaches and how he handles his materials in a sermon. In every case the underlying purpose seems to be to lead the man in the pew to see life through the eyes of one who is close to God. Thus the sermons touch life at its vital spots down where it is lived. The writer never loses sight of the people before him. He knows their disturbed thoughts about prayer and sorrow and injustice and faith and the purpose of life. He preaches with one aim—"that the reader should catch, if only a whisper, some message of the Eternal Voice and respond to it."

Since these sermons are printed practically as they were delivered, men who do not enjoy reading a volume of sermons may not like the direct method of address retained in this collection. Nevertheless, many a paragraph will give the reader a fresh desire to go and preach so that people might live. Most any one will find these sermons both practical and inspiring. The approach and the illustrations will bring new insight to any preacher who is trying to minister to men and their needs. Dr. Weatherhead has included a questionnaire for group discussion, a suggested Bible reading, and a prayer for each sermon. A number of the prayers are his own. All in all the book is a good reflection of his viewpoint.

JOHN S. BISHOP

The Radio For Christ. By Walter A. Maier. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939. 417 pages. \$1.50.

This book of sermons is the sixth in the series of the Lutheran Hour, broadcast last year ending April 1939. The volume in typical American fashion gets "bigger and better" each year, and the sixty-six stations carrying the broadcast was the largest number over which the Lutheran Hour had yet been heard.

The title of the book bears comment. Since we have the radio as a mixed blessing, used for every conceivable purpose, one is struck with the phrase "the Radio for Christ." This instrument is used with great effect to stimulate congregational life, to bring a message to those in isolated areas, as well as to cheer countless shut-ins throughout the homes and institutions of the nation. May God bless the radio for Christ!

These sermons are characteristic of what we have had in previous volumes. They are strong, soul-stirring, evangelistic sermons preached as a final message to dying men. This sense of urgency on nearly every page makes the sermons compelling. A wide range of themes presents the heart of the Gospel. Jesus Christ is exalted; He is God and Saviour. Of the twenty-seven sermons, five are on Old Testament texts, twenty-one are on the New Testament, with one double text from both.

Dr. Maier is one of the two best-known Lutheran preachers in America. His radio ministry has brought a wide hearing, for he speaks each Sunday of the winter months over the air to more listeners than many of us have in a given lifetime. Hundreds of thousands of letters have been received testifying to the vigorous, powerful Gospel preaching of this man. I have heard Dr. Maier in person and over the air. It is a privilege to read these sermons of his, and give them some study. One would wish him to be less polemic at times, less harsh in his judgments of his brethren in the ministry. Certain statements of other radio preachers seem especially uncalled for when the world is so wide and the air is for all.

As an example of fine Gospel preaching, as a book of sermons presenting Dr. Maier at his best, and as an example of contemporary Lutheran preaching, this volume is warmly commended.

T. BENTON PEERY

The Evangel of a New World. By Albert Edward Day. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1939. 160 pages. \$1.50.

In the five lectures, delivered at Emory University, composing this book, Dr. Day analyzes the pessimism of our time and offers as a cure the Christian evangel. This sounds trite enough, but the discussion is anything but trite. The analysis of modern disillusionment, pessimism, and despair, is keen, penetrating, and sound. Over against this pessimism the author sets "a burning word of hope," the evangel. The heart of this evangel is discovered to be the kingdom of God, which is interpreted as both a reality beyond the processes of history and a reality within them—within them, not inherently, but by the invasion of the divine into them. "God is in the process as its sustaining, vital element. God is beyond the process as its flying goal" (p. 60). The God beyond is ever breaking into the process. Herein lies man's individual and social hope. But, while it is God who thus produces the coming of the kingdom, man has a task to perform: to eliminate or restrain personal or social evil to the extent of his ability. The criterion for judging what is evil is "access to the kingdom of God." Whatever blocks man's way to the kingdom is evil. Here follows a fine application of the criterion to modern life, particularly social life. All the discovered evil can be restrained and overcome only as men learn to know that God is a God of love, and

find redemption in Him. The difficulties that lie in the way of man's acceptance of God as a God of love are frankly faced. The author shows that there is a way into the mind and heart of modern man—a way that leads to conviction that God is a God of love. The evangel can be preached so as to convict of sin, create aspirations after holiness, and lead to transformation of human life. How it should not be preached is fully indicated; how it should be is not so definitely set forth.

This sketchy survey of the content of the book does poor justice to its depths of thought, its discriminating analyses, its truly beautiful style (a least bit artificial in the fourth lecture), its fine social passion, and its Christian spirit. The book is worth reading, pondering, digesting. The reviewer has read it three times, each time with greater profit.

PAUL J. HOH

The Devotional Use of the Bible. By Peter Green. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. 86 pages. 60 cents.

One who has tried to prepare a bibliography on the *use* of the Bible for any purpose whatever, has met with an astonishing disappointment. He may be thinking of the layman's use, the student's use, the pastor's use. The result is the same. He finds that we do not have even one adequate volume bearing upon a particular phase of the subject, or a single comprehensive survey of the whole field.

This little volume, therefore, is a welcome addition to a meager literature. One laments only its brevity. The style is charming. The content is both inspiring and helpful. Much has been packed into small compass. Some such title as "Personal Use of the Bible" would have been better since the author goes beyond the devotional emphasis to include reading for historical instruction and literary appreciation.

The book can be recommended for both pastors and laymen.

RALPH D. HEIM

Helps to the Study of the Bible. Second Edition. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1931. Approximately 800 pages, 116 plates. \$3.

We are grateful to the managers of the Oxford Press for this new edition of a standard work. There have been numerous corrections, alterations, and additions. In some cases whole sections have been rewritten. The names of the editors and writers have been withheld on the ground that they are simply passing on information that is "the common property of Biblical scholarship."

The book is a compendium of Biblical lore. It is designed to serve as a handy reference volume on the 'externalities' of the Scriptures. With this volume on his shelf, the Bible student has at his fingers' tips a wealth of useful background information. There are thumb-nail sketches of the individual books, including the Apocrypha. There are authoritative notes on subjects ranging all the way from the Aquatic Creatures of the Bible to the Ethnology of the Jews. A separate section takes the form of a Subject Index and Concordance. Another is devoted to Bible Illustrations. It consists of a series of 104 plates, mostly of an archaeological character, with 56 pages of explanatory notes describing the plates and indicating their significance. At the end of the book we find a splendid Indexed Atlas, with 12 plates of maps. The maps are exceptionally clear.

The general point of view is conservative but not traditional. The editors state that "while unproved hypotheses are not taken into account, the results of the new

knowledge are frankly faced." We note by way of illustration that they reject the Petrine authorship of Second Peter but defend the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.

Most of us have learned not to look for perfection in books of this type. In this case the attentive reader will observe that some "unproved hypotheses" have crept into the text and that the information given is at times more bizarre than relevant. On the other hand, some such reference volume should be in the library of every student of the Scriptures and this is one of the best. It is concise, it is comprehensive, and it is useful.

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

Paul, Man of Conflict. By Donald Wayne Riddle. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1940. 244 pages. \$2.

Recognizing that "the time is ripe for a new life of Paul" because of the "parallel advances in research in the history of primitive Christianity and in new and fruitful discoveries in the study of New Testament literature," Professor Riddle of Chicago University attempts a biographical sketch that is to be both critical and appreciative. The book is timely and succinct, simple in style, clear in outline. Its major fault lies in its omissions. What the author says, in passing, of Paul's letter to the Galatians, seems to me to be applicable to his own work: "If one is willing to grant his premises, it must be admitted that the conclusions follow logically. But it is quite unnecessary to grant the premises." This is really true not of most of Dr. Riddle's premises but only of a few, most of which are not critical but interpretative.

His main critical premises are outlined and briefly defended in two Appendices. They are: (1) The two main sources for a biographical study of Paul, his letters and the account of his activities in Acts, are of very unequal value. The letters are primary sources. The stories in Luke-Acts are secondary and incidental. They are neither complete nor historically accurate. They appear only for what they contribute to the major purpose of the writing, which is "to relate defensively the story of Christianity's rise and expansion" and to do this in an artful, illustrative way that would appeal especially to Roman ears. Therefore one must discount the anti-Jewish and pro-Roman emphases found there, the over-eagerness to show "emerging Christianity to be politically innocuous." The stories of Paul's conversion, the council at Jerusalem, etc. found in Acts must be interpreted wholly in the light of the autobiographical sources in Paul's letters.

(2) Similar considerations should lead one to criticize somewhat radically the traditional chronological outline of the missionary journeys based on Acts, since the narrative there is "schematic, typical, illustrative, tendentious" and quite incomplete. The classic sequence of Paul's letters must be revised on the basis of data derived from the letters themselves. In attempting such a revision, Dr. Riddle finds "the determining feature in the crisis which took place in Galatia and Corinth in the matter of the relation of Jews and non-Jews," coming, as it did, after Paul's initial work there and after "the approval of his policy by the Jerusalem leaders." He finds the Thessalonian letters and the imprisonment epistles of Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon as well as I Corinthians as antedating that crisis. The imprisonment letters he sees coming out of a political imprisonment in Ephesus. I Corinthians is placed immediately after his release. Then comes the Jerusalem conference and the crisis which followed it. This crisis is reflected at its height in Galatians, Phil. 3:2-16, and II Cor. 10-13. After the situation has cleared and the victory was temporarily won comes II Cor. 1-9, "the tenderest, most emotional letter he ever wrote, expressing his joy and relief." Then

Paul proceeds to complete his journey for collecting in behalf of the poor in Jerusalem. Finally, before leaving Corinth, he writes a long letter to a church he has never seen but often contemplated visiting, Rome.

The letter to the Romans is seen as "a reasoned survey of the past, an estimate of the present, and a forecast of the future." It reflects all his earlier conflicts. It mentions his suspicion that when he goes to Jerusalem a minority of the false brethren will again make trouble for him (Rom. 15:17-29). With Romans, Dr. Riddle feels, "the primary sources end their contribution. In default of this traditions of varying value must be interrogated to learn the outcome." Luke-Acts, in this instance as before, can be read only "after scientific interrogation." He thinks the Ignatian-Clement tradition of Paul's martyrdom in the arena ought to be given serious consideration. Concerning the story in Acts he concludes that the rough facts are true but the detailed picture is unhistorical.

"Ephesians" he regards as a general introductory letter written later by one who began the collecting, editing, copying, and general circulation of Paul's letters. "The Pastorals" are viewed as pseudonymous polemics directed against Marcionite anti-Semitism.

With these critical premises one may argue detailed points, but we must give serious consideration to the picture as a whole. But when we turn from the critical to the interpretative premises we find them equally stimulating but less satisfactorily grounded. Let us consider a number of them:

(1) Dr. Riddle writes: "The sources furnish the material. Conflict enables them to be understood. Paul is allowed to speak for himself. But he is understood only when conflict is perceived as the essential key." The soundness of this viewpoint is ably defended and illustrated. Our only demur arises out of the consciousness that this strong insistence upon a crisis viewpoint sounds so very, very Barthian.

(2) Paul's letters need to be understood fundamentally as the message of a Christian evangelist. This viewpoint is soundly, solidly Lutheran, even though Dr. Riddle later criticizes us as Lutherans, charging that our theology has tended to "over-emphasize the theological aspect of the message and make a theologian of one who was a missionary."

(3) Only after we have given full sway to the interpretation of Paul above indicated ought we give any consideration to the influence of Palestinian or Hellenistic Judaism as such, or to Stoicism or the economic and political environments of that day, or to the mystery religions, etc. All these touched Paul, but only in an external and superficial way.

(4) Paul's religious background was such that he was a zealous Messianist with a thoroughgoing apocalyptic eschatology long before he came into contact with Christianity. This thesis still remains to be demonstrated. It is an assumption which even Schweitzer's *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* has not substantiated.

(5) Before his conversion Paul could not have been sensitive to heresy since "Judaism permitted considerable latitude of belief." Thus he was offended not so much by the ascription of Messiahship to Jesus as by the free association of Jews and non-Jews in the Christian fellowship. This thesis on its negative side seems indefensible in the light of Paul's repeated references to the Cross and crucifixion of Jesus as a particular stumbling-block to the Jews who wanted to think of him as Messiah. Here a more serious consideration of George Matheson's *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, which incidentally is not mentioned in the bibliography, would have been worthwhile.

(6) Paul's ethic was the highest Judaism could produce. But it bore little or no relation to the life and teachings of the historical Jesus of whom Paul knew and was interested in knowing only a minimum. This is the most unsatisfactory element in

Dr. Riddle's sketch. It provides no adequate explanation of Paul's Christ-mysticism and its distinctive, personal moral quality. There is no real recognition of what Deissmann called "re-acting mysticism" and Porter "thinking all things in the light of Jesus Christ." In fact Porter's study of *The Mind of Christ in Paul* is also missing from the bibliography. It is difficult to understand, psychologically, how a person who in life, teaching, and personal character was as vague to Paul as Jesus must have been, according to Dr. Riddle, could have caused such a strong emotional re-action. It is hard, too, to picture I Cor. 13 as merely the product of Paul's inherited Hebraic morality. If the author had followed Deissmann in his analyses of these aspects of Paul's experiences as faithfully as he followed him in so many other matters, his picture would ring truer to life. The least he should have done was to develop and defend his negative theses far more fully than he does. Discussions of these matters in the later chapters would have been much more profitable than his repeated summarizings of materials previously developed.

The few Biblical quotations given are the author's own translations from the Westcott and Hort text. The critical notes are gathered together in a special section following the text of the sketch itself. They are of value for their pertinent references to the best bibliography on the particular aspect of Paul under discussion at the moment. Besides the omissions referred to I noted no reference to Glover's *Paul of Tarsus* or Bacon's *Jesus and Paul*.

WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER

The Founding of the Church Universal. By Hans Lietzmann. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938. 432 pages. \$4.

This volume, the second in the important new series on church history by Hans Lietzmann, belongs also to the general series edited by William Adams Brown and others and known as the International Library of Christian Knowledge. It is the sequel to Lietzmann's *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* and carries the history from the time of Trajan to that of Decius, or from the early Christian apologists to Origen inclusive.

It would be hard to find a more serviceable or attractive book on the period in question than this graceful English translation of a thoroughly up-to-date and competent German work. Approximately on the same scale as H. M. Gwatkin's two volume work entitled *Early Church History*, which appeared in 1912, it is the equal of Gwatkin in sprightliness and interest, while broader in scope and richer in content. Of special merit is the manner in which the general history of the Roman Empire from 100-250 A. D. is furnished in the first chapter as a background for the story of the church. This preliminary sketch is far more than a cursory outline. It includes a likely description of Roman fortifications and barbarian threats of invasion, a careful account of the principal heathen temples of antiquity, and a picturesque paragraph on the recently excavated Jewish synagogue at Dura on the Euphrates, while the literature, philosophy, and religions of the age are also surveyed.

Chapter II on "The Church" handles the question of the earliest ecclesiastical traditions with fairness both to Rome and to the East. Concerning the former Lietzmann frankly admits (p. 85), "The roots of the Roman primacy extend deeply into the early history of Christianity." On the other hand he maintains (p. 86), "Rome's attempt to claim a superior voice was denied at that time (second century) on all hands." Lietzmann concludes that in the church at large there was an original equality of apostolic authority among the bishops which lasted well into the third century.

Chapter III, entitled "The New Testament," gives about equal attention to the elements of the New Testament and to the New Testament Apocrypha. Lietzmann appears to hold a lower estimate of the canonical Acts of the Apostles than did his brilliant predecessor, Harnack. But he readily acclaims the author of Revelation as a "creative artist" in contrast to the author of the Shepherd of Hermas whom he terms a "humble hand-worker" (p. 117). In Chapter IV the theology of the church and its earliest creeds come up for examination. The old Roman creed is traced back to a simpler trinitarian confession in the East which had as its source Paul's creed in I Corinthians 8:6. Adoptionism and the Virgin Birth are discussed. Of the latter it is said that the doctrine enjoyed the very widest acceptance (p. 152). Lietzmann believes that the pagan world was familiar with the idea of divinely caused virgin births; that the traditions of the Hellenistic rabbis welcomed the same concept; and that Paul was acquainted with this Hellenistic Jewish tradition (p. 154).

The next chapter, on Worship, is of great value, including as it does an unusual account of the earliest Christian art (pp. 183-192). The author holds that the Eucharist was in this period a sacrifice in a three-fold sense: (a) as thanksgiving; (b) as an offering of bread and wine; (c) as a sacrificial meal. If Lietzmann's rationale is correct it would appear that the development, while going beyond New Testament ideas, was logical if not inevitable; and that it had its roots in the New Testament. Lietzmann calls our attention in this connection to the circle of ideas already contained in I Corinthians 10:18-21.

The church's upward gaze in the chapter on worship is followed significantly by a chapter entitled "Christianity Face to Face with the World." This includes not only aspects of Christian life in a more strongly pagan environment than anything we know today but also a brief, vivid account of the persecutions.

The apologists are next dealt with in a masterly survey quite unlike anything which has hitherto appeared in English. Our author's thesis is that the early apologists attempted a tremendously important task for Christianity which proved far too great for their inferior powers. They are to be admired for what they aimed at and initiated rather than for what they achieved. Interestingly enough, however, he insists upon the definitely *churchly* character of their life and thought (pp. 241-242). Of the Epistle to Diognetus he observes that its author may have been the tutor of Marcus Aurelius and that "its idyllic description of Christianity and its epigrammatic phraseology are very famous." In general he remarks (p. 232), "The purpose of the apologists in writing was to contribute towards the kind of literature that was recognized in the world of culture." He concludes, "They won the spirit of Greek science for the message of the Church." The present reviewer found this chapter on the apologists the most stimulating and provocative in the book. It was evident that Lietzmann has given to this subject his most intensive thought.

The rest of the book is devoted to outstanding teachers and heretics of the church. Here the gifted author breaks new ground in historical writing, at least in the field of church history. Instead of treating each man as an abstract unit in the history of Christian thought as has so often been done, he places each one in his own proper milieu, with a rich *regional* background of Christian life as actually influenced by geographical and other local factors. The result is a series of most life-like portraits of both fathers and heretics. Beginning with Asia Minor and the Montanists we are escorted in successive chapters through Gaul, where we meet Ibaeus, into Africa where we encounter Tertullian, then on to Rome and Hippolytus, and then into Syria and the further orient where Bardesanes and Mani come alive. The climax of our journey is attained in Egypt where we company a long time with Clement and Origen. Our "Interpreter" in this Pilgrim's Progress of the ancient church is Lietzmann himself who

finds himself most at home in the "House Beautiful" of the Alexandrian fathers, the first and most famous of all the catechetical schools. It is not fashionable for modern men to place themselves at the feet of the ancients, but Lietzmann is not ashamed to call them fathers. Of Clement he assures us that "succeeding ages have not done him justice" (p. 388). But to Origen he pays the highest tribute of all (p. 417): "We must admit that he did not possess the entire Paul, the entire John, the entire Gospel, but in this respect who has been his superior? What theologian to the present day is able to boast that he has laid hold of everything which the New Testament sources have given to the world? Origen lived in the Bible to an extent which perhaps no one else has rivalled, except Luther."

The book is furnished with a Chronological Table, a good index, a list of literature which is supplementary to that contained in Volume I, and a brief bibliography of books in English drawn up by the translator. The name of F. J. A. Hort is misprinted "Hart" in this last list (p. 421). It is gratifying to an American reader to find a German scholar in the course of a historical work quoting repeatedly from specialists whose principal labors have been performed in this country, namely, Goodspeed, C. H. Kraeling, A. O. Nock, Rostovtzeff, and La Piana. It is unnecessary to add that the sources and the German literature are abundantly quoted. The footnotes are numerous but concise.

WILLIAM H. COOPER

Luther. Von 1483 bis 1522 (Vol. I); *Von 1522 bis 1546* (Vol. II). By Rudolf Thiel. Berlin: Paul Neff Verlag, 1937. 372, 374 pages.

Rudolf Thiel, the author of this remarkable life of Luther, was not a theologian or even a Luther-scholar before he began this work. He was a scientist, a professor of biology in a Berlin school. He was led to Luther, humanly speaking, only by the accident of a publisher's commission to write his life; but Luther gripped him and would not let him go. A man trained in careful scientific method, he began by making an exhaustive study of Luther's writings in his spare time. He immersed himself in the mighty volumes of the Weimar Edition, he mastered the difficulties of the Latin exposition of the Psalms of 1513-15, he studied Ficker's edition of the lectures on Romans of 1515-16, Schubert's edition of Galatians and Ficker's edition of Hebrews, 1516-17, and mined the rest of the mountain of source material; and on that basis produced a portrait of the Reformer so trustworthy and withal so fundamentally thrilling and gripping that it excels, in the opinion of this reviewer, any previous full-length biography. How eminently desirable it would be to have its equal in English!

The remarkable arrangement of materials in the first volume will strike the reader as strange and incomprehensible in spite of the author's apology for it in the preface. Part One, entitled "Prelude: The Heretic," narrates the external events from 1517 to 1521 "from the point of view of Luther's opponents; Part Two, "The Monk," describes Luther's inner development through this same period; and Part Three, "The Fighter," gives the action of the Reformation to 1521. This arrangement leads to some annoying repetitions. This structure, however, does not detract in the least from our opinion of the really unusual readableness of the work. The demands which Thiel makes of his readers in the way of religious profundity and severity is gratifying. This is no watered-down popularization, but readers, nevertheless, will not lay it down half read. The uncommonly happy weaving in of Luther's own words is no small part of the value and charm of both volumes. The style is impressionistic, as witness the chapter headings in Part II: "Thunder," "Sacred Day-labor," "Struggles," "God's grace—God's love," "Original Sin," "Work-righteousness," "David's Psalter—Christ's

Cross," or in Part III, "Attack," "Alarm," "Joy," "Scorn," "Friendship," "Wrath," "Faith," "Defiance," "Devil," "Storm"; but it is an impressionism based, as we have said, upon a most meticulous study of detail.

In Volume II Thiel's interpretation of the later, aging Luther treads on more controversial ground. For Thiel, after 1530 Luther was no longer the "Leader," but only the "Guardian" of his faith, and these words describe the whole of Volume II. The style has the same verse as in Volume I, but something is lacking, something unhappy trails through the whole second part. Rather strangely, everything that had to do with Luther's failures, vexations, utopias, disillusionments, and disappointments is given strong emphasis. Typical is this (p. 237): "Not a ray of light! Morality is running wild and depravity prevails," and Luther blames himself for it. The author says that Luther's last fifteen years were an "uninterrupted martyrdom." "He had to experience the age-old contradiction between the ideal and the real, and experience it so deeply and agonizingly as did hardly any other man who wanted to make mankind happy" (p. 235). Thiel even emphasizes that Luther had no certainty of salvation (*Heilsgewissheit*), but rather "a quaking conscience, an eternally struggling and eternally uncertain heart." And he goes so far as to call that the *Urgrund von Lutherischer Religion*! "Uncertainty as an incentive to higher, braver, freer action—that is the vital meaning of the faith of Luther. And of that Master Philip defrauded evangelical Christianity when he debased faith into knowledge" (p. 219). Rather hard on poor Master Philip! So, according to Thiel, Luther's faith is the exact opposite of that certainty of salvation which Melancthon made of it; it was rather an abiding in uncertainty concerning the hidden will of the incomprehensible and unknown God. Perhaps here the author has not plumbed the ultimate depths of the comfort in Luther's view of the Lord's Supper.

Another emphasis of Thiel's is his assertion that after Luther's return from the Wartburg in 1522 he "sounded retreat from the war with the Pope and declared war on the Devil," because he saw his good news being corrupted into antinomianism. This assertion requires further examination. Another point made by Thiel: Luther's ideal of the church was the fellowship of earnest Christians, but in his disillusionment with an evil world he permitted this ideal to degenerate in the establishment of provincial churches. Luther's failure or refusal to act on the question of organization and church discipline was due to the fact that he did not feel himself called to rule a church, but only to proclaim the Word. We are left with a picture of the dreadful disillusionment in Wittenberg and the resignation of old age.

Thiel's view of Luther's faith deserves careful examination and the final verdict requires a deeper knowledge beyond the skill of this reviewer, but the entire second volume is proof of the value and necessity for deeper study of the "old" Luther.

JOHN W. DOBERSTEIN

A Teacher and His Times. By William Adams Brown. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1940. 390 pages. \$3.50.

In a subtitle Dr. Brown describes his autobiography as *A Story of Two Worlds*. He does not tell us whether he meant this to be understood geographically, chronologically, or experientially. It is a true description in any of these senses. The story is the story of one whose interests spanned the ocean, whose years spanned the changes from the old order to the new, and whose work and activities brought him into intimate contact not only with two, but as he admits toward the close of his book, with a dozen different worlds. In each of these worlds he was called upon to play a part. To each of them he made valuable contributions.

The story opens with the New York of the 70's. There is an intimate portrayal of the domestic life of the elder Brown's family; of the schools of the period; of the Yale of the 80's; of Union Seminary as Dr. Brown knew it fifty years ago; of the customs and foibles of the day. Graduate study in Berlin gave him a first-hand impression of Harnack as a teacher, and the admiration in which he came to hold him is still reflected as he writes about him.

On his return from Europe he became associated with Union Seminary as a teacher, a position which he filled for thirty-eight years. The difficulties of the seminary with the Presbyterian Church are recounted; the Briggs' trial is reviewed; the embarrassment of the youthful teacher upon whom was thrust unexpectedly the chair of systematic theology at a critical period in the Seminary's life—all this is faithfully and frankly recorded, with such comments as only an eye-witness could supply. It makes a fascinating story now that it can be read in retrospect.

Dr. Brown was never the cloistered student. In reading the story of his life one is necessarily brought into the stream of contemporary events, political, reformatory, educational, as well as ecclesiastical. To those who knew the New York of his day, what he writes concerning Dr. Parkhurst's picturesque struggle with Tammany, the Lexnow investigation, the difficulties which the Raines Law Hotel created, the experiences of the Presbyterian Church with the Labor Temple, will revive nostalgic memories. But it is not as one who was a mere spectator that Dr. Brown writes. He was an active participant in the reform movements of his day.

With America's entry into the war, another opportunity for usefulness came to Dr. Brown. As secretary of the General Wartime Commission of the Churches he had immediate knowledge of what the churches did to mitigate the moral and spiritual effects of the war. He therefore writes as an apologist for the churches against the unfriendly criticism which was directed against them after the war. This chapter has an historical value and will constitute authentic source material for those who desire to know the truth.

For seventeen years Dr. Brown served as a permanent Fellow of the Yale Corporation, taking a leading part in "Helping to Unify a Great University," which is the title of one of the important chapters of the book. He was also a member of the Lindsay Commission which investigated Christian Colleges in India; and theological consultant to Prof. Mark A. May in the preparation of the four volumes on the *Education of American Ministers*.

Among the most important activities in which he has been engaged, however, Dr. Brown would probably count the ecumenical conferences where the subject of church unity has been to the fore. This is the end for which he has labored unceasingly. Catholic in spirit, ready and able to appreciate what others possess that is of value, he has dreamed of the time when the Christian church would again be one. Dr. Brown will not live long enough to see his dream fulfilled. To him, however, belongs no small part of the credit for the better understanding which the varied groups in Christendom have now come to have of one another. His life has been intimately associated with each successive step by which the World Council of Churches has come into being.

As a book, *A Teacher and His Times* is heartily recommended as an informing commentary on the life and movement of a section of Protestantism within which Dr. Brown may justifiably assume the rôle of spokesman. Charmingly written, with a wealth of detail, replete with intimate portraits of the men in both Great Britain and America whose names, for one reason or another, have become familiar names to all Protestantism, it constitutes a valuable chronicle of the times.

E. E. FISCHER

Religion and the State in Georgia in the Eighteenth Century. By Reba Carolyn Strickland. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. 211 pages. \$2.50.

Georgia was at first a proprietary colony, then a royal colony, and finally a state independent of Great Britain. During the colonial period it was inhabited by a variety of religious groups: Anglicans, Lutherans, Moravians, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, a few Quakers and Jews, and fewer Roman Catholics. To set forth the relations between these governments and these religious groups is the task which Miss Strickland undertook, and she has succeeded in producing a workmanlike account.

During the proprietary period the dissenters in Georgia enjoyed greater freedom than their brethren in England. The president of Savannah County was instructed in 1741 to "allow a free toleration of all Protestant dissenters of every denomination" and not to "exercise any inquisition on the private opinions of anyone but permit liberty of conscience to all that . . . give no offense or scandal to the government established." When Georgia became a royal colony attempts were made to establish the Church of England, but these attempts were only partially successful. Dissenters continued to be tolerated, and they quickly outnumbered the favored Anglicans. Complete religious liberty was finally achieved after the Revolution, in 1798.

Lutherans played a not unimportant part in the early history of Georgia. Most of these were Salzburgers. Driven from their homes by the ruthless persecution of their Catholic ruler in 1731, thousands of Salzburg Lutherans were scattered throughout Germany. About three hundred of these refugees, aided by German and English charities, migrated to Georgia, where they found a hospitable reception. They were granted special privileges both in the exercise of their religion and in the development of comfortable living conditions. During the Revolution they "tried to remain neutral, but the desecration of their church by the British was enough to make them rebels." Here and elsewhere Miss Strickland might have examined the extensive records of the Lutherans more carefully. Her knowledge of German, reflected even in consistently incorrect citations, has been a handicap. But she has generally made a diligent and intelligent use of sources. Her study is a valuable addition to the growing literature on the relations of church and state in America.

T. G. TAPPERT

The Philosophy of John Dewey. The Library of Living Philosophies, Vol. I. Edited by Paul Arthur Schilpp. Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University, 1939. xv, 708 pages. \$5.

It may not be in place for one whose major interests are only in part related to philosophy to review this volume. Long ago I saw a statement that while not all men are philosophers, all are the products of a philosophy. Then, too, it may be in order to call attention to the character of the work rather than attempt to add one more criticism of the philosophy of Dewey.

The book strikes out along a new line. It is none other than to have experts in philosophy criticize—be it favorably or unfavorably—and then give the one criticized the opportunity to answer such criticisms while he is still alive. Besides this there is also a biographical sketch of the philosopher and a list of all his published works and articles. These add immensely to the interest of the book. It is not too much to say that the personal equation as given in the biography must be taken into account in order to understand this or, it may be, any other philosophy. Another chapter might well have been added on the effect that the American spirit or environment has had on Dewey's philosophy. A discipline that teaches how to do things—is not this the

American ideal and is it not this that has made Dewey the outstanding American philosopher? The headings of Dewey's writings alone cover sixty-six pages. They are arranged in the order in which they were written. This makes the list most valuable for it also shows the evolution of the ideas that this philosopher has promulgated.

No less than seventeen specialists in philosophy here give their appraisal of Dewey's distinctive system. These centre around his views of philosophy and its task, logic, science, epistemology, social ethics, esthetics, education, and religion. What a range for one man to cover! And yet philosophy must take a comprehensive view. The unifying thought that is made to cover all these is what has been called instrumentalism.

Since all these various specialists have here given a critical appraisal of Dewey's philosophy as it relates itself to the various departments of life and thought, it would be presumptuous to attempt any detailed presentation of all of these in a review. Suffice it to say that all differ more or less from the philosopher—even those who may be called his disciples. Thus the paper on the history of philosophy regards him as dismissing its history too cavalierly. His logic, which is that of pragmatism, is criticized most severely by another philosopher who yet has this in common that both have no place in their philosophy for the supernatural. It goes without saying that his view of religion is criticized. In his reply he makes a very dogmatic assertion against dogmatism when he expresses his "belief that the association of religion with the *supernatural* tends by its own nature to breed the dogmatic and the divisive spirit." What if the supernatural be accepted as the Father after whom the whole family in heaven and on earth is named? It is however encouraging to notice that while he would put away the supernaturalism of the race's immaturity, he would still rely "upon the resources of the scientific search for truth and upon a democratic way of life to generate a more humane, more liberal, and broader religious attitude." That the religious attitude is thus respected is only what one would expect of a philosopher who has such a high purpose of promoting human welfare. May one not point out that if the scientific instruments and democracy fail—and recent history may well warn us of such a danger—our savants may yet come to realize that the stone which our builders now reject must yet be made the head of the corner?

Perhaps the least critical and most laudatory of all the papers is that of "Dewey on Education." There is no doubt that in directing attention to the very practical use of education he has made his greatest contribution. But even here the contest between progressivists and essentialists, as they call themselves, is still on. Dewey's influence on the Orient where education had been until recently altogether in classics, as in China for instance, must be recognized, and yet it is yet to be proved that the progressivists can dispense with the essentialists. It may have to be by keeping what is good in both that education will reach its highest development.

One could wish that some one would give us a wider application of Instrumentalism so-called. It would seem that this could cover all that this philosophy aims at and include what it lacks. Man after all is still in the making. Can he keep the "religious attitude" without the religious foundation? Do we not need the supernatural not to make us unnatural but to make us really human?

But the value of this book is not to be judged by one's agreement or disagreement with Dewey's philosophy. The book makes a new venture and we welcome it. It enables us better to understand a philosopher of noble ideals who has had immense influence on America and perhaps quite as much on China. Other books are projected along similar lines on Santayana, Croce, Russell, and Brunschvicg, and others may be added. We may often learn as much from those from whom we differ as from those with whom we agree. We welcome the volume and express the belief that all who have an interest in the questions of philosophy will look forward with eager expectation to the completion of the series of which this is the first volume.

JOHN ABERLY

The Message of Jesus Christ. By Martin Dibelius, translated by Frederick C. Grant. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939. \$2.

This book marks the second stage of the development of that school of New Testament critical study which is so closely connected with the name of Dr. Dibelius. It is the logical outcome of the first stage, which was inaugurated by the publication of *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, the English translation of the Second Edition of which appeared in 1933 under the title of "From Tradition to Gospel." The term 'Formgeschichte' has become quite familiar to Biblical scholars in recent times. Dr. Dibelius is responsible for the term and is both the pioneer and the best exponent of this method of the critical study of the New Testament.

To those unfamiliar with this method of study it may be said, first, that it deals largely with that most difficult of New Testament problems, namely, the origin of the gospel records as we have them; and secondly, that instead of aiming to render the New Testament in the literal manner of the many modern translations, it rather regards the Gospels and Acts, and to some extent the other New Testament books, as mosaics of sermons, paradigms, tales and legends which had become traditionally fixed by the preaching missions of the early church. As far as the Gospel accounts are concerned, these consist of these fragments gathered and loosely connected together by later writers in the form in which we at present have them. A main problem of the method is the picking out and isolating of fixed traditional heritage from the connecting material in which the compilers of the gospels embedded them. This is what Dr. Dibelius does in the book under review, setting forth the results of the methods up to date. There is that which is impressive in the book. The short gems which have been isolated and rendered as separate units appear in peculiar beauty and simplicity.

That certain expressions, statements and forms soon became fixed in the vocabulary of the early church goes without saying and the devout Christian scholar deeply appreciates the critical efforts to isolate these and looks forward to any light which a study of these will throw on the beginnings of the Christian movement. The main quarrel which one has with the "Formgeschichte" method does not lie along these lines but rather in the main presuppositions which form its basis. For example, it starts with the presupposition, based on the fact that all of the books of the New Testament appear in Greek and not in Aramaic, that the Gospels were written very late, certainly after 70 A. D., and by those who had little or no personal knowledge of the actual life of Jesus at all. The element of personal witness in the accounts of the writers of the Gospels is, therefore, reduced to a minimum if not altogether eliminated. Such a presupposition rides in roughshod fashion over a statement such as that of Papias that the Gospel of Mark consists of the personal witness of Peter.

Starting from such a presupposition the question arises as to how the various fixed forms, tales about Jesus, parables and miracles, arose and became a part of the traditional heritage of the Christian community. It is at this point that opportunity is allowed for the wildest sort of speculative interpretation. For example, some months ago, we happened in at the regular morning service of one of our Lutheran congregations. The young pastor had as his text the Feeding of the Five Thousand. He began his interpretation by recounting how, in Roman society, it was customary for wealthy people, as an act of religious merit, to appoint a certain day and distribute food to the multitudes who gathered. As the early Church grew and wealthy people became members, the problem arose of getting them to help the poor. Christian preachers, in order to induce wealthy Christians to show generosity related the examples of wealthy non-Christians. Gradually such tales became a part of the Christian gospel message and were attributed to Jesus. The inferences from such an interpretation are obvious, and

one begins to wonder whether Jesus Himself was not more or less of a mythical character.

The "Formgeschichte" method of New Testament study is as yet new and unevaluated. Furthermore it deals with that most difficult of New Testament problems, the question of origins. In his book, *The Validity of the Gospel Record*, Dr. E. F. Scott says, "The problem of origins is always an insoluble one. At the end of his search the explorer comes always on many streams that combine to make a river; and each of them issues from springs which are hidden underground. So the course of Gospel tradition cannot be traced beyond a certain point. We know that before anything was written the church possessed records of Jesus, but how they originated, or what their earliest character, we shall never know." The personal witness note in the New Testament records cannot be obliterated. One ever feels that note of conviction:—"What we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes and have looked upon, and that which we have handled with our hands of the word of life, that we declare unto you."

J. E. GRAEFE

The Historical Open Questions among American Lutherans. By Theodor Hanssen. Burlington, Iowa: Lutheran Literary Board, 1936. 105 pages. Paper, 60 cents.

A member of the Missouri Synod who has participated in recent intersynodical conferences here exposes what he regards as the gross doctrinal errors of the American Lutheran Church. The danger that the Missouri Synod "might join this merger happily did not materialize." Such a departure from Missouri's traditional isolation would have been unfortunate, the author holds, because the American Lutheran Church officially tolerates departures from Scriptural doctrines by "arbitrarily and deceitfully" calling these articles of faith "theological opinions" or "exegetical deductions." Thus questions settled and closed by the authority of the Scriptures are transformed into open questions by the authority of a church government. Of course, this is a revival of an old controversy between the Missouri Synod and the former Iowa Synod, which controversy is now extended to the American Lutheran Church as a whole. The questions discussed are old too: the church, the ministry, the Christian Sunday, the pope as anti-Christ, the millenium, and Confessional subscription. Added is a brief treatment of the Scriptures which centers the attack on Professor Reu's Dubuque Formula of 1926; this Formula "is equal to a denial of verbal inspiration . . . and amounts to treating the truthfulness and authority of the Holy Scripture practically as an 'open question.'" The author asserts (as of 1936) that there can be no closer fellowship between the Synodical Conference and other Lutheran bodies in America until the latter give up their "open questions." This little work is significant, not so much on account of the character of its argument, but because it reminds us that controversies which began nearly a century ago have not yet been settled to the satisfaction of all.

T. G. TAPPERT

BOOKS RECEIVED

For the information of its readers and in acknowledgment to the publishers, THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY publishes the following list of books received. More extended notice will be given to as many of them as space permits.

- Barnett, Albert E., *Understanding the Parables of Our Lord*. Nashville: Cokesbury, 1940. 223 pages. \$2.
- Dallmann, William, *William Tyndale, the Translator of the English Bible*. Fourth edition, revised. St. Louis: Concordia, n.d. 81 pages. Paper, 25 cents.
- Dierks, Hartwig, *The Social Teachings of Moses and of Representative Prophets*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1940. 159 pages. Paper, 50 cents.
- Filson, Floyd V., *Pioneers of the Primitive Church*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1940. 194 pages. \$2.
- Gearhart, Robert H., Jr., *The Romance of the Creed Builders*. Philadelphia: Castle Press, 1940. 67 pages. 75 cents.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J., *Christianity Goes to Press*. New York: Macmillan, 1940. 115 pages. \$1.50.
- Graebner, Theodore, *The White House and the Vatican. A Reply to a Roman Archbishop*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1940. 7 pages. Paper, 5 cents.
- Grant, Frederick C., *The Gospel of the Kingdom*. New York: Macmillan, 1940. 204 pages. \$2.
- Jones, Philip C., *The Church School Superintendent*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1939. 112 pages. \$1.
- Kenyon, Frederic, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. Fourth edition. New York: Harpers, 1940. 266 pages. \$3.
- Lankenau, F. C., *Frederick James Lankenau: a Biography*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1940. 20 pages. Paper, 10 cents.
- Maier, Walter A., *For Better Not for Worse. A Manual of Christian Marriage*. Third edition, revised. St. Louis: Concordia, 1939. 598 pages. \$2.50.
- Reid, James, *Facing Life With Christ*. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1940. 184 pages. \$1.50.
- Schwehn, W. G., *What Is Buchmanism?* St. Louis: Concordia, 1940. 32 pages. Paper, 12 cents.
- Strodach, Paul Zeller, *The Collect for the Day*. Philadelphia: United Lutheran, 1939. 263 pages. \$2.
- Waterhouse, Eric S., *Psychology and Pastoral Work*. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1940. 316 pages. \$2.50.

AIDS IN DEEPENING FAITH AND DEVOTION

THE COLLECT FOR THE DAY

By Paul Zeller Strodach

The Proper Collects used at Divine Worship on the Sundays and Festivals of the Church Year are considered in their historic setting and interpreted devotionally for the worshiper. This is a companion volume to the author's "The Church Year." For leaders in worship and all desirous of attuning themselves to the spirit of devotion of the saints of the centuries, this is an invaluable aid that merits a place in one's study or prayer nook, together with the servicebook, as preparation is made for participation in the worship of the congregation, or for use in one's private devotions.

Cloth. 262 pp. \$2.00

THE CHURCH YEAR

Studies in the Introits, Collects, Epistles and Gospels.

By Paul Zeller Strodach

An adequate description, in the light of the life of Christ and the Church, of the Church Year, week by week, and event by event. Its helpful revelation of the origin, significance and beauty of these portions of the service of worship makes it a valuable practical reference work and devotional manual both for the worshiper and the leader in worship.

Cloth. 265 pp. \$1.50

OREMUS

Collects, Devotions, Litanies from Ancient and Modern Sources.

Compiled by Paul Zeller Strodach

This manual provides a ready and rich medium for the expression of the spirit of prayer in most of the experiences and for many of the occasions of life. The choicest expressions from the vast store of outpourings of great souls of all ages are represented as well as those developed in the life of the Church.

Blue Keratol. 16mo. 213 pp. 75 cents

THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH

By Charles M. Jacobs

These devotional studies on the "Apostles' Creed" emphasize the personal religious values which this Creed possesses. They are scholarly yet eminently practical. They deal with profound truths but reach the average man. Their reading will be richly rewarding for earnest seekers after the truth and church members generally who desire fuller acquaintance with the basic certainties of the Christian faith.

Cloth. \$1.00

THE ROMANCE OF THE CREED BUILDERS

By Robert Harris Gearhart, Jr.

This study takes one behind the scenes and reveals the reason why and the manner in which the historic Creeds came to be. The author's purpose is achieved through a description of the facts and experiences through which the early Christians lived and out of which the early Creeds of the Church grew, especially the "Apostles' Creed." Realizing what these Creeds cost the men and women who poured into them the greatest and best which men have ever come to know, one is helped in this day to a deeper appreciation of the values of these ancient Creeds.

Cloth. 75 cents

THE UNITED LUTHERAN PUBLICATION HOUSE

1228-1234 SPRUCE STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.